

GOOD ENOUGH TO WORK, NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO STAY: A REVIEW OF THE
SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROGRAM

by

Janna Pushkar, BA, University of Western Ontario, 2009

A Major Research Paper
Presented to Ryerson University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in the Program of
Immigration and Settlement Studies

Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2010

© Janna Pushkar 2010

HD
1529
.P98
2010

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this major research paper.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this paper to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this paper by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

GOOD ENOUGH TO WORK, NOT GOOD ENOUGH TO STAY: A REVIEW OF THE SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL WORKER PROGRAM

Janna Pushkar
Master of Arts, 2010
Immigration and Settlement Studies
Ryerson University

ABSTRACT

This critical literature review examines the ways in which the agricultural sector in Canada has changed from small family farming to largely mechanized and consolidated farms, thus requiring the need for the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP). It also finds that the program was created not only for economic but also for political reasons and it continues to function for both economic and political motivations. Since the program's inception, there has been a shift from permanent to temporary migration in many industries in Canada because foreign temporary workers such as those involved in the SAWP, labour under unfree conditions making them a reliable and disposable workforce. The denial of citizenship status to seasonal agricultural workers serves to maintain their vulnerable position in the Canadian workforce. Finally it is revealed that the program is primarily beneficial for the Canadian government and Canadian employers. Workers and sending countries receive an economic benefit from the program as well, however this impact is much more significant for the Canadian state.

Key words: Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program; temporary foreign workers; political economy; citizenship

Acknowledgments

I would firstly like to extend my gratitude to my supervisor John Shields for his input and advice and for making the entire MRP process painless. I would also like to thank my second reader Bryan Evans for his academic input and thoughtful questions. I am thankful to Erin for her constant support throughout the course of the year. I will meet you under the mistletoe. Finally I would like to extend a thank you to my partner David for his endless positivity, encouragement, and support.

Table of Contents

Glossary.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
— Theoretical Framework.....	2
— Structural Changes in Canadian Agriculture and the Need for Foreign Workers.....	5
— The Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program.....	11
— The Canadian Economy and Agriculture.....	14
— Migration to Canada – The Move from Permanent to <u>Temporary Migration</u>	16
— (Non) Citizenship and the SAWP – Maintaining a Vulnerable Workforce.....	22
— The Economic Impact of Remittances on Mexico and Caribbean Countries.....	40
Conclusion.....	49
APPENDIX A.....	52
References.....	53

Glossary

Acronyms

CIC	Citizenship and Immigration Canada
FARMS	Foreign Agricultural Resources Management Services
HRSDC	Human Resources and Skills Development Canada
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LCP	Live-In Caregiver Program
UFCW	United Food and Commercial Workers
NIEAP	Non-Immigrant Employment Authorization Program
SAW	Seasonal Agricultural Worker
SAWP	Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program
TFW	Temporary Foreign Worker
TFWP	Temporary Foreign Worker Program
UN	United Nations

Introduction

In a growing globalized economy, the flow of capital, goods, and people travels throughout the world. In order for states to compete in a global economy, various sectors require the labour of temporary foreign workers (TFW) to increase productivity and efficiency often through the skill and cheapness of the labour provided. The Canadian agricultural sector has become increasingly dependent in its use of TFWs, which serves as a solution to competing with other countries such as the United States. This is not surprising given that farming in Canada has transformed from small family farming to large consolidated farms that require intensive capital investment and are at the mercy of global market forces (Shields, 1992). The program under which migrant farm workers enter Canada is the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP), whereby workers are recruited from Mexico and the Caribbean to supplement domestic labour on Canadian farms for several months a year, without being given the opportunity for obtaining permanent residence status. /

[The majority of the literature on this SAWP maintains the view that the program has been built and sustained entirely in the economic interests of employers and the state whose interests lie in the overall benefits these migrants bring to the Canadian economy.] This critical literature review will be conducted within a political economy framework that will help us to more deeply examine the economic and political foundations of this relationship. This review will explore the historical reasons for the creation of the SAWP, the justifications for the use of temporary workers, the ways in which the SAWP benefits the Canadian economy and Canadian farmers, and the program mechanisms that have ensured the subordination of SAWs themselves. Finally, it will assess the positive

and/or negative impacts of the program on Mexican and Caribbean migrants and their countries' respective economies. It is important to critically assess the literature in order to determine if the reasons for the creation of the program are justified and to determine whether or not this program remains necessary for the Canadian economy.

A number of research questions will be addressed regarding the program's use within the global economy for Canada. The research questions I am taking into consideration include: "In what ways has the agricultural sector changed in Canada that has prompted the increased need for migrant labour? Can the agricultural sector function and prosper without seasonal agricultural workers (SAWs)? Has the SAWP been created solely for the benefit of the Canadian economy? Who in Canada benefits from the SAWP? What mechanisms have been employed to ensure that SAWs remain vulnerable and exploitable for employers and for the Canadian economy? Lastly, do Mexico and Caribbean countries derive a significant economic benefit from this program?

Theoretical Framework

Modern political economic theory is interdisciplinary in nature and therefore can be approached from a number of theoretical perspectives. The disciplines that are appropriate for this paper as they apply to the migrant farm worker program are primarily comprised of political science, economics, and law. The term "globalization" is a useful starting point when discussing migration and the use of cheap international labour, as it sheds light on how nation-states and their respective economies are interconnected. The definition of globalization is debated among academics because it pertains to a wide range of global changes in technology, economy, politics, and culture. The pertinent

features of globalization that have been chosen for this review are comprised of the economic and political dimensions.

Kacowicz (2007) explains that economic changes worldwide occur “through the internationalization and de-territorialization of production, the greatly increased mobility of capital and of transnational (multinational) corporations, and the deepening and intensification of economic interdependence” (505). As a result, financial capital becomes mobile, and people, labour, and knowledge follow. Ideological changes accompany an interdependent economic system, which include an emphasis on global competitiveness, fiscal restraint, privatization, trade liberalization, and deregulation (Kacowicz, 2007; Satzewich, 2007).

The ability of multinational and transnational corporations in addition to market forces to determine how the economy functions should not be overemphasized. The nation-state remains relevant despite the internationalization of trade. Hirst and Thompson (1995) stress that even within a globalized economy, states have not become obsolete, but continue to maintain their sovereignty. Although international corporations, agencies, and policies in the form of sanctions and treaties exist, they have been created because powerful nation-states agreed upon their creation. Consequently, the capitalist system and the ideologies that accompany it are social constructions. Therefore the economy is not apolitical as particular states hold more economic power than others, such as Australia and those located in North America and Europe. Powerful states are able to use economic power to threaten and coerce other nations into taking economic actions that benefit them (Hirst & Thompson, 1995). Gardezi (1995) contends that transnational financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF)

primarily represent the views of Western nations and are able to enforce neo-liberal policies upon poorer nations by creating conditions on the loans that they offer for underdeveloped countries.

|As national markets have opened up, cheap labour pools have been increasingly exploited by economically powerful states.| Satzewich (1991) uses a Marxist analysis to explain that between national economies, there are imbalances between states. Therefore states may have a surplus reserve army of labour, or an inadequate amount of labour may exist within the state, which accounts for most international labour migration. The need for the accumulation of capital may push workers from their country of origin and pull them toward another country where opportunities for employment are improved. Gardezi (1995) argues that workers' ability to bargain and organize has been undermined by the fact that powerful states have easy access to cheap labour. For instance, domestic workers compete with workers in less developed countries that are willing to work for lower wages. |Low-wage workers from underdeveloped nations also compete with workers from other Third World nations as they seek employment abroad for similar employment opportunities, which often offer poor working conditions and low wages (Basok, 2002). |Furthermore, states "have adopted agendas aimed at slashing the costs of labour and the cost of social and economic programmes" making TFWs increasingly more vulnerable and exploitable (Gardezi, 1995: 3). |

Satzewich (2007) explains that political economists have often theorized that governments have utilized immigration policy as a means to regulate the labour market by searching out the cheapest and most exploitable labour possible. Therefore, the main purpose of immigration for governments has been to secure and accumulate capital.

However, he argues this explanation is too functional. He claims that interest groups and lobbyists affect policy decisions, because much of immigration policy is created in response to their requests.

Globalized international markets are therefore politicized given that some countries are more powerful than others and are able to push their own economic agendas on to other states. A globalized economic system has consequences for temporary foreign labour which usually benefits receiving countries as they are in the position to present employment prospects. This review will thus be written from the perspective that Canada, as a relatively economically significant state, has the ability to attract cheap foreign labour, which allows for economic growth and increased competitiveness in the global market.

Structural Changes in Canadian Agriculture and the Need for Foreign Workers

The ways in which the Canadian agricultural sector has developed since World War II has affected how the sector functions and the necessity for hired labour. The traditional family farm began to be replaced by commercialized farming during the 1940s, which was highly dependent on paid labour and was subject to international market forces (Shields, 1992; Wall, 1992). Commercialized farms are distinguished from family farming in that they produce mainly for international markets and tend to be very large, mechanized, monocultural, and dependent on chemical methods such as the use of chemical fertilizer and pesticides. These methods of farming require high inputs of capital and energy (Norberg-Hodge et. al., 2002).

Prior to the World War II, local workers in nearby communities were employed on farms if there were insufficient numbers of family members to work the land (Basok, 2002; Wall, 1994). Farm employment decreased since the 1940s as a result of the decline of the family farm and the rise of farm mechanization and consolidation (Basok, 2002; Wall, 1994). By 1968, the federal government reported that the agricultural sector was among the most corporately concentrated sectors in Canada (Winson, 1993).

Consolidation is evident with the examination of the number of growers between the 1940s and 1990s. Between 1954 and 1958 there were 5,714 growers in Ontario with a production output of 224,699 tons. By 1988 the number was reduced to 827 growers, with an output of 555,037 tons; it can thus be seen that although the number of farms decreased, their size and efficiency increased dramatically (Wall, 1994: 69).

Consolidation intensified even more during the 1990s (Shields, 2004). Gibb (2006) and Preibisch (2007b) report that currently six companies in total control 80 per cent of food sales in Canada. Two firms control nearly 55 per cent of the entire market (Preibisch, 2007b: 427). Part of the reason for consolidation in the agricultural sector can be attributed to “price-cost squeeze” for small family farms. The cost of producing commodities has been rising much faster than the price of the product for consumers. Consequently, many farmers have been forced to abandon agriculture and seek employment in the industrial sector, as they are not able compete with large corporate farms (Basok, 2002).

Prior to the 1940s paid farm labour was already being utilized on many farms, although it has always been difficult for employers to keep domestic workers. As a result, the agricultural sector has constantly suffered a high turnover rate. Farm work is

considered one of the most dangerous occupations in Canada (Wall, 1994). It is associated with poor working conditions that include intense manual labour, rural isolation, and exposure to the vagaries of weather (Wall, 1992). In addition, farm workers are paid minimum wage, do not have the right to unionize, and until very recently have been historically exempt from health and safety regulations (Shields, 2004). As a result many domestic workers are not interested in working in this sector which contributes to the fact that farm labour tends to be seasonal and dependent on immigrant or migrant labour (Shields, 1992).

Wall (1994) argues that the number of employees began to decline after the Second World War with the introduction of mechanized harvesting which reduced the number of employees required to seed, maintain, and harvest farmland. For example in 1941, the number of people employed in the agricultural sector was 28.6 per cent of the population and by 1968 the number had decreased dramatically to 7.2 per cent (Satzewich, 1991: 58). However Basok (2002) asserts that technology did not eliminate the need for hired labour completely for two reasons. The first reason is that some farmers do not wish to invest in expensive technology due to the high cost of such investments. The second reason is that crops such as apples, cucumbers, peppers, and tomatoes must be harvested manually (Shields, 1992; Winson, 1993). Tomatoes in particular cannot withstand mechanical harvesting, as they are too fragile for machine harvesting. This is a foremost reason why Leamington (a small town in southwestern Ontario) commonly named Canada's "tomato capital" has one of the largest concentrations of SAWs (Basok, 2002).

Once farms began to be consolidated labour shortages arose thus causing employers to lobby the Canadian government for access to migrant workers from the Caribbean. They argued that the sector was having great difficulty attracting and maintaining adequate supplies of labour due to the arduous work associated with farm labour (Satzewich, 1991, 2007). Basok (2002) adds that industrialization and the creation of new better paying jobs also reduced the number of employers available to farmers. Hennebry (2006) suggests in addition to the poor working conditions of farm labour, demographic factors contributed and continue to contribute to shortages. She explains that Canada has an aging population, low fertility rates, and couples are reproducing later in life meaning there are fewer Canadian born people of working age to be employed on farms. Furthermore, the younger generation is attaining higher levels of education and therefore is not seeking employment in the farming sector (Hennebry, 2006: 25).

Initially the government denied employers' requests for foreign labour on the basis of three reasons. Satzewich (1991) argues the government believed that there was an adequate labour pool that could be dipped into from rural children, aboriginals, psychiatric patients, and unemployed Francophone Canadians. In addition, Satzewich (2007) claims that this was not the entire truth; immigration officials also believed there was an adequate supply of white migrant workers from Europe that could fill the labour gap and therefore there was little need to look elsewhere. Thus the third reason for the denial of the employers' requests may have been based upon the fact that the Caribbean

population is racialized and authorities were reluctant to allow blacks to enter the country.¹

Employers persisted in lobbying the government, arguing that domestic workers were inexperienced and managed to withstand a day or two of labour before quitting. In addition farmers complained that due to their lack of experience, domestic workers were half as productive as a seasoned farm workers. Canadian authorities finally responded by allowing 264 workers from the Caribbean to enter the country with temporary work visas in 1966 and extended the same opportunities to Mexican workers in 1974 (Basok, 2002, 2003; Preibisch, 2007a; Satzewich, 1991, 2007; UFCW, 2007). Satzewich (1991) argues that the government finally surrendered to the requests because it was increasingly being criticized for employing racist immigration policy and this decision was made as a means to counteract these allegations.

Satzewich (2007) claims there were political reasons for the inclusion of Mexico several years later, considering that the Caribbean had a very large supply of migrants available for the SAWP. He maintains that immigration bureaucrats needed to include Mexico because their ability to supply Ontario farmers with migrant labour was being questioned; therefore action was taken to reassert their legitimacy. During the early

¹ The Canadian government's reluctance to allow racialized populations, particularly blacks and Asians, into the country has a long and complicated history. The government has employed racist immigration policy over a number of decades. Racist elements of immigration policies were officially removed from legislation in 1962 and 1967 with the introduction of the new *Immigration Act*, which allowed applicants to immigrate based on a point system. However, the purpose of these changes was not to address the explicit racism in policy; instead the changes were made to increase Canada's competitiveness in the global economic market by allowing for a wider range of migrants to enter the national labour market (Stalker, 2000). For a brief overview of racism in Canadian immigration policy, refer to Goldring & Krishnamurti (2007: pp.67-82) or for an in depth history of race relations and settlement in Canada, refer to Kelley & Trebilcock (2000).

1970s the wages for Caribbean workers were raising yearly, while the cost of many crops, such as apples, was increasing at a much slower pace. Producers were finding it more difficult to pay workers, yet at the same time, they were still needed. Thus farmers began to search out cheaper labour among the domestic workforce. They often chose undocumented or marginalized workers such as entire families of Mexican Mennonites, children, pregnant women, or sick adults (Basok, 2002; Satzewich, 2007).

A Task Force report conducted by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in 1973 revealed the kind of populations that were being used to supplement SAWs as well as the poor working conditions that employees were exposed to (Basok, 2004; Satzewich, 2007). In 1974 an agreement was signed with Mexico due to the high numbers of undocumented workers entering Canada that originated from the country. The agreement was meant to guarantee regulated, safe working conditions, humane treatment of workers, and legal, assisted transportation between countries (Basok, 2002, 2004; Preibisch, 2004). Despite these ambitions, the intentions of the program have not necessarily been realized in practice. It will shortly be revealed that the only goal the government was able to guarantee was the legal and assisted transportation into the country.

The SAWP allowed 203 Mexican SAWs into Canada during the first year of the program. The Department of Manpower and Immigration believed this was a valuable decision stating that it was “a useful development in the sense that competition will aid Canadian producers in bargaining conditions with the Caribbean authorities” (Satzewich, 2007: 272). This development would eventually allow producers to lower wages so that they were able to afford migrant labour. Human Resources and Skills Development

Canada (HRSDC), the government sector responsible for running the SAWP, has commented on the competitive structure of the program as well, stating that a high level of competition is healthy and beneficial for the program because participating countries will be more responsive to employers' demands (Verma, 2003).

Satzewich (2007) stresses, contrary to the analysis of many researchers who write from the political economy perspective, and whose analyses are overly driven by neo-classical economic perspectives (Basok, 2000, 2002; Preibisch, 2007a; Smart, 1997; Wall, 1992, 1994), that immigration officials had political considerations other than economic incentives when they made the decision to add Mexico to a temporary migration program. There had been political pressure upon immigration authorities to provide farmers with an adequate supply of labour in order to ensure the healthy functioning of the sector. The abuse of undocumented workers and other marginalized populations were construed by farmers as the only viable option left, as the government was unwilling to allow the increased employment of foreign workers (Basok, 2002; Satzewich, 2007). However, in line with other authors, Satzewich (2007) recognizes that the economic benefits of adding Mexico to the program was also an important consideration for officials.

The Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program

Although the SAWP initially started out as a small program, it has grown considerably since its inception. This program has become important for Canada as it competes in the world market with the U.S. which relies on both the labour of documented and undocumented workers (Preibisch, 2007a). Current estimates indicate

that the number of workers entering Canada under the SAWP is approaching 20,000 people. The majority of migrants have traditionally been male and this trend continues into the present day. Women have been able to participate since 1989, yet they constitute only 3 to 4 per cent of all migrant agricultural workers; however, that number is slowly increasing (Becerril, 2007). Most workers are concentrated in Ontario (80 per cent) and Quebec (15 per cent) and 5 per cent are spread throughout Alberta, Manitoba, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick (Preibisch, 2007b).

HRSDC runs the program for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC). In order for an employer to obtain a temporary foreign worker he or she is required to prove that a Canadian citizen is not available for the job. If HRSDC provides a positive Labour Market Opinion agreeing that no one from the domestic workforce is available, CIC then provides the migrant labourer with a work permit (Sweetman & Warman, 2010). Foreign Agricultural Resource Management Services (FARMS) administers the program in Ontario, reporting to HRSDC. The role of FARMS is to arrange travel plans for SAWs and work with government staff to ensure the paperwork and logistics of the program run smoothly. FARMS is a non-profit organization comprised of elected farmers. It is funded by employer user fees, part of which are deducted from employee wages, and works in the interests of employers (Gibb, 2006; Verma, 2003). Verma (2003) notes that FARMS has significant power over migrant workers in getting its policy agenda pushed forward. She writes that HRSDC depends on FARMS to gather and report statistics on the program, as Statistics Canada does not gather information on this particular program. Based on these statistics, FARMS provides the federal government with policy recommendations. Verma fails to provide examples of the type of recommendations that

who views her
role in policy.

FARMS makes, therefore it is difficult to assess the degree of bias in the suggestions. It may be presumed that the recommendations are made in favour of employer interests and downplays or ignores any abuses that occur in the workplace, however there is currently no evidence to confirm this.

Work permits are given for a minimum of six weeks and up to a maximum of eight months with a specific employer. However the average length of a contract is 3.5 months (Russell, 2007). Once a contract had ended, it is possible to sign another contract with another employer and to stay in Canada until the end of the second contract, albeit this is a lengthy process and requires the approval of government authorities (FARMS, 2010). For the most part, during the length of the work agreement SAWs are not permitted to switch employers or occupations. Finally, SAWs must leave the country within seven days of the expiration of their contract (NAALC, 2002; Verma, 2003).

Regardless of the number of years that workers return, they are not able to apply for permanent residence meaning they remain stagnant in their jobs without the opportunity for upward mobility (Basok, 2004; Preibisch, 2007a).

Workers are recruited in their home countries through their Ministries of Labour. A large number of workers return to Canada yearly. In fact some workers have been employed under the SAWP for nearly twenty years (NAALC, 2002; Preibisch, 2007a). Much of this can be attributed to the practice of “naming” whereby an employer requests a worker to return for the next season by name (Verma, 2003). Basok (2000) argues this is a positive aspect of the program as it makes it less likely that workers remain in Canada and become undocumented or illegal. It gives workers a sense of security for future employment in the upcoming year. However, Basok and other critics (Gibb, 2006;

Verma, 2003) recognize that naming creates paternalistic relationships between employer and employee with the balance of power favouring the employer. Naming discourages workers from complaining about housing or workplace safety in the hopes of being named for the next year and thus having a guaranteed job (Verma, 2003).

The Canadian Economy and Agriculture

There is evidence that the SAWP provides an economic benefit for Canada and is thus important for the economy. Aceytuno and Greenhill (1999) state that the benefit of foreign labour for the national economy is a three-step process. First, production and consequently exports increase as a result of additional labour, then farm productivity becomes greater with foreign workers, and finally increased production and productivity allow for the reduction of costs for employers, ultimately allowing for farmers to be competitive in the global market (6). This has certainly been the pattern for the agricultural sector.

The agricultural sector is highly valuable for the Canadian economy. In 2000 the sector brought in \$100 billion in food retail and sales, accounting for 8 per cent of Canada's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Crops that depend on SAWs including apples, peaches, tobacco, tomatoes, cucumbers, cherries, and ginseng, brought in \$13.7 billion in the following year (Weston & Scarpa de Masellis, 2004: 3). Ontario, the main site for migrant farm workers, exported \$7.4 billion in various food products to the U.S. in 2004 and \$51.4 million to Mexico in the same year (Gibb, 2006: 6).

The expansion of the horticulture and floriculture industries in Canada has often been cited as a central reason for the increased requirement for migrant farm workers

(Preibisch, 2007b). On the national scale, the horticulture industry ranks second to cattle as the most valuable category, raking in \$6.8 billion (Preibisch, 2007b). The greenhouse industry grew extensively between 1988 and 1997, with the value increasing from \$80 million to \$250 million (Basok, 2002: 73). The growth of the SAWP during the 1990s resulted from the industry's expansion during the past fifteen years (Preibisch, 2007a). Exports of horticultural crops brought in \$2.6 billion in 2000, many of which were sold to the U.S. (Weston and Scarpa de Masellis, 2004: 3).

This industry has not escaped consolidation and has had a similar history as the Canadian agricultural sector. Weston and Scarpa de Masellis (2004) cite that in 1996, 42 per cent of all fruits and vegetables were produced by 5.5 per cent of all horticultural farms (3). Preibisch (2007b) found that over the past ten years the number of SAWs working in the greenhouse industry increased from 7 per cent to 19 per cent of all migrant agricultural workers (422). It is not surprising that increased greenhouse production has led to increased hiring of SAWs as greenhouse crops are highly perishable and therefore require a very large, and efficient labour force to harvest the crops (Colby, 1997).

Leamington, the "tomato capital" of Ontario that was previously mentioned, has the largest concentration of greenhouses in North America. In 2001 Leamington had a greenhouse industry bigger than the entire greenhouse industry in the United States (Basok, 2003, 2004). It is not a coincidence that the largest percentage of migrant farm workers is concentrated in this area as well (Basok, 2002). The horticultural industry is heavily reliant on the migrant labour. FARMS believes the industry must be 100% efficient in order to function properly and the unreliable Canadian workforce is a setback, making the importation of migrant workers a necessity. In 1995, FARMS estimated that

each horticulture worker represented U.S. \$7,285 of economic activity per month, which amounts to an impressive U.S. \$182,125,000 per year (Colby, 1997: 8). Industry experts also argue that if the sector were to lose migrant labour, then most of the crops would not exist and consequently the half of Canada's horticultural industry would be lost to imports (Preibisch, 2007b).

Although the literature illustrates how the expansion of the horticulture industry has coincided with increased use of SAWs, Basok (2000), Preibisch (2007a, 2007b) and Colby (1997) fail to take into consideration that the increased use of SAWs is not limited to the horticultural industry in Canada and in fact are taking place in a number of industries throughout the country. Expansions in the greenhouse and other industries are not the sole reasons for increased importation of migrant labour. Increased usage of SAWs and other temporary workers can be attributed to larger migration patterns in Canada, such as the existing shift from permanent to temporary migration.

Migration to Canada – The Move from Permanent to Temporary Migration

The importance of agriculture to the Canadian economy coupled with the sector's difficulty in maintaining reliable domestic workers, illustrates the importance of migrant workers for the country. Recent scholarship on migration to Canada reveals that there has been a shift from permanent migration to a pattern of temporary migration, suggesting that Canada is becoming heavily dependent on temporary foreign workers (Flecker, 2010; Preibisch, 2007b; Sharma, 2006; Siemiatycki, 2010; Sweetman & Warman, 2010; Trumper & Wong, 2010; Nakache, 2010). The most recent statistics show that in 2008 192,519 temporary workers were admitted, while only 149,072

permanent residents were admitted under the Economic Immigrant Class which included skilled workers, entrepreneurs, and investors. The number of TFWs is four times greater than the number of all principal applicants that were admitted under the points system (Siemiatycki, 2010: 60). Sharma (2006) reports that there has been almost a consistent 4:1 ratio in favour of unfree wage labour since the 1980s, although this number fluctuates slightly. However for the most part, the ratio has remained steady or continues to rise. The current estimate for the total number of migrant workers for 2008 in Canada is 302,303, which is a 22% increase from 2007 (Nakache, 2010: 45). In the agricultural sector migrant workers have become the core source of labour, and the domestic workforce supplements migrants when there are not enough of them (Preibisch, 2007b).

In 2006, the newly elected Conservative government introduced its new economic plan stating its commitment “to create the best educated, most skilled, and *flexible* workforce in the world” (Flecker, 2010: 99). In February 2008, Finance Minister Jim Flaherty announced that the Conservatives were working on a “just-in-time” immigration system whereby employers would have access to migrant workers whenever they were needed (Siemiatycki, 2010: 61). However the shift to temporary migration had been in motion many years prior to the Conservatives’ promises to establish a flexible workforce.

A number of temporary foreign worker programs have been introduced in Canada throughout its history, beginning with the arrival of Chinese migrants that were recruited to build the Canadian Pacific Railway in the 1880s. Agricultural and domestic workers have also been used for a number of decades through the SAWP and the Live-In Caregiver Program (LCP). Both of these programs have taken advantage of a flexible, and vulnerable workforce (Siemiatycki, 2010; Trumper & Wong, 2010). These programs

have been created in response to labour shortages within the Canadian population driving employers to seek for a labour force outside of the country. Applicants seeking landed status and who wish to enter the agricultural or domestic worker field are denied entry unless they apply through the temporary foreign worker programs (Sharma, 2006).

The increase in the recruitment of temporary workers began to rise dramatically in 1973 with the creation of the Non-Immigrant Employment Authorization Program (NIEAP). The program's purpose was to regulate the movement of temporary workers into high skilled professions such as academia, engineering, and business. Ultimately middle- and low-skilled professions such as construction, mining, lumbering, and logging were added at the request of Canadian employers. By the 1990s, the program's name was changed to its current designation: the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP) (Sharma, 2006; Trumper & Wong, 2010). The program ensures that workers are tied to a single employer for a stipulated amount of time, and are required to exit the country at the expiration of the contract (Nakache, 2010). Presently TFWs are employed in a number of different industries, ones that require both skilled and unskilled labour. In addition to the aforementioned industries, migrants may be hired as sports figures, artists or high-tech workers such as computer programmers, software designers, senior animation effects editors, and computer systems analysts (Sharma, 2006; Trumper & Wong, 2010).

In 2003, the Low Skill Pilot Program was introduced as part of the Temporary Foreign Worker Program (TFWP) for employers that require low or unskilled workers. This was extended to the agricultural sector as well giving employers the option of choosing to hire workers through the SAWP or through the low skill program (Preibisch,

2007b; Sweetman & Warman, 2010; Weston & Scarpa de Masellis, 2004). This program has rarely been addressed in the academic literature, even though it is very pertinent and may greatly impact the SAWP. The Pilot Program has been criticized for its higher degree of deregulation, meaning that workers have even less government oversight and protection (Preibisch, 2007b; Trumper & Wong, 2010; UFCW, 2007). The main differences between the SAWP and the Pilot Program are that the new program is not part of a bilateral agreement, it is less regulated, it does not require annual review, the cost to the employer is lower as only transportation and not housing must be paid, and employers are not bound to particular source countries; instead, employers can apply to use a worker from any country they desire (FARMS, 2010; Preibisch, 2007b; Weston & Scarpa de Masellis, 2004). Workers may also stay in the country for up to two years and may switch employers if the new employer receives a positive labour market opinion from HRSDC (FARMS, 2010).

Preibisch (2007b) posits that although the government does not release statistics on who uses the Pilot Program, her own research suggests that particular employers may wish to use it instead of the SAWP, such as those that are not given access to the SAWP including employers who cannot use the SAWP due to poor working and living conditions or employers who do not have onsite housing available. Unlike the SAWP, the Pilot Project does not require that workers live on the work site (FARMS, 2010). There can be potential for abuse given that the program is less regulated, and it gives farmers the opportunity to create greater competition and consequently subservience among SAWs by threatening to employ workers from other parts of the world. In consequence, future research needs to focus on the impacts of this program and ask, how

does the fact that SAWs work alongside employees under the Pilot Project affect workplace relationships? Does there appear to be a higher degree of exploitation of workers under one program than the other? How does the low skill project affect the numbers of workers recruited under the SAWP? Is there a trend towards the preferred use of the Pilot Project over the SAWP?

Sharma (2006) provides a very useful critique of the approach taken by Canadian immigration authorities in defining labour shortages, which serves to legitimize Canada's increasing recruitment of TFWs. The employment validation process justifies the idea that migrants may be brought in for labour, only if Canadian citizens have refused to do the job. A government document states that the recruitment of TFWs must be investigated to see whether or not it will be beneficial for the economy by making Canada internationally competitive (Sharma, 2006). This serves to create an us and them or citizens versus noncitizens divide.

Labour shortages are not determined simply by quantitative, but also qualitative measures. Canadian farmers do not have access to a particular *type* of workforce: one that is politically powerless and therefore must accept the conditions of its employment (Sharma, 2006). The discourse surrounding labour shortages within the context of the SAWP calls for "reliable" and "flexible" labour (Preibisch & Santamaria, 2006). Verma (2003) claims that the term "reliable" here candidly means "no threat of leaving the job during critical harvest periods despite low wages and difficult working conditions" (8). Colby (1997) found that workers are aware that they must be viewed as reliable and thus felt that they needed to appear very obedient if they wished to be considered "good" workers by their employers.

In order to further illustrate that labour shortages are not defined merely in quantitative terms, Sharma compares unemployment rates to the admission rates of TFWs. She finds that while the unemployment rate had risen immensely in 1983 to 11.9 per cent, the number of migrant workers admitted that year had been 87,700. In 1993, although the rate had remained at 11.9 per cent, the number of migrant workers continued to rise to 153,988, an increase of about 65,000 workers. The top industries employing temporary workers were ones that required unskilled labour such as farming, service, and fabricating (Sharma, 2006: 122). Sharma's analysis of labour shortages is applicable to the SAWP and fills the gaps in the works of Basok (2002) and Preibisch (2007a, 2007b), where it has been argued that the predominant reason for the expansion of the SAWP has been the growth of the horticulture industry. This is not to argue that quantitative labour shortages are exaggerated; employers do have a legitimate claim that they are not able to attract large numbers of domestic workers for farm labour. However, the *type* of labour force they are attempting to attract is also a consideration for employers.

Satzewich (1990, 1991), Basok (2002), and Sharma (2006) theorize that states have been increasingly employing TFWs because, put simply, they are valuable. This value derives from the fact that unskilled temporary foreign workers are in highly vulnerable and exploitable positions for the reason that they have been forced into positions of "unfree labour" which have been influenced by neo-liberal policies. Satzewich (1991) explains how migrant workers, under an internationalized economic system, may be "free" or "unfree" depending on their ability to circulate in the labour market. Satzewich (1990) defines free labour from a Marxist perspective, as relations of

production whereby people are forced to sell their labour for money. Unfree labour refers to “workers whose ability to circulate in the labour market is restrained through political and legal compulsion” (Basok, 2002: 4). Although some temporary workers are given the option of changing employers or employment sector, such as those in skilled professions, agricultural workers in Canada are not afforded the same opportunities.

Basok (2002) claims that unskilled TFWs such as SAWs are unfree because their economic position in the world forces them to seek wage labour in countries outside of their home. This economic position is based on how the global economy functions and creates divisions between the north and south (Preibisch, 2007b; Siemiatycki, 2010). Once workers are inside a foreign country, they are tied to their contracts that specify the conditions of their employment and limit labour mobility. The very fact that migrants are categorized as “temporary” and therefore are not afforded citizenship status, limits their bargaining abilities for social and political rights. Labour markets for temporary and domestic workers are assumed to be separate and therefore have different rules and expectations (Sharma, 2006).

(Non) Citizenship and the SAWP – Maintaining a Vulnerable Workforce

Numerous researchers have examined the ways in which citizenship – or rather noncitizenship status – is used as a tool for exploiting SAWs and other migrant workers (Baines & Sharma, 2002; Basok, 2003, 2004; Preibisch, 2004, 2007a; Sharma, 2006). There are a number of theories regarding the construction of citizenship both socially and legally. T.H. Marshall’s classical notion of citizenship has served as a starting point for modern and current theories of citizenship. In 1950, Marshall hypothesized that

citizenship was attained in three stages: civil, political, and social. Civil citizenship pertains to rights such as freedom of speech and thought, as well as the right to own property and the right to justice, whereas political citizenship allows for the right to vote and run for public office. Finally social citizenship is concerned with an individual's inclusion in society in regard to one's economic security, the right to share in the social heritage, and finally the right to live the life of a civilized being (Baines & Sharma, 2002).

Feminist and anti-racist scholars have criticized the first two stages in particular, pointing out that these rights have not always been available to women and racialized minorities, thereby illustrating the need to expand the definition to include these realities (Baines & Sharma, 2002; Preibisch, 2007a). Preibisch (2007a) argues that this definition is based upon a white, European male ideal and fails to address the ways in which all three forms of citizenship are mediated by race, class, and gender. The concept of citizenship must not only address gender, race, and class, but also other layers of citizenship such as people's membership across and within nation-states and the ways in which these relationships are constructed in historical contexts (Baines & Sharma, 2002; Preibisch, 2007a).

Stasiulis and Bakan extend their analysis of citizenship specifically to migrant workers. They argue that citizenship is an "ideological construct that is negotiated between differently empowered individuals and the state. This negotiation is criss-crossed with relations of class, race, and gender which are best understood within the broader international context of globalized markets and hierarchies among states" (Stasiulis & Bakan, 2005 cited in Baines & Sharma, 2002: 83). Therefore categories of

citizen and non-citizen are socially constructed through nation-states' immigration policies and law. Historically in Canada, the citizen has been constructed predominantly as a British male who is deserving of political power, resources, and good employment, while the "Other" is excluded from these privileges and is deemed to be unworthy (Baines & Sharma, 2002).

Although this paper will not examine the role of race in depth, it is important to note that the SAWP and temporary migration in general is mediated by race as well as gender and class. Therefore, even though policy makers may base their decisions on economic incentives, these decisions are tainted with racial biases. Satzewich (1991) and Wall (1992) have considered racism in the design and implementation of the SAWP albeit there continues to be a scarcity of research on this topic. The available research on the topic suggests that it took the Canadian government almost twenty years to allow Caribbean workers to migrate to Canada for employment because it was claimed that they would not be able to survive the climate in Canada. In addition immigration authorities believed that the presence of black people would create "racial problems" within the country (Satzewich, 1990, 1991). Preibisch (2004) focused on the ways in which race relations impact everyday relationships and lives of SAWs within their communities. She found that SAWs believe local community members hold racial stereotypes about Mexicans and Jamaicans. This is exemplified through racist comments made about SAWs and the fact that local community members do not regularly interact with SAWs.

Sharma (2006) comments on race and shifting migration patterns, arguing that racialized populations increasingly continue to move across borders. One hundred years

ago the majority of migrants were White people although this trend has changed to include racialized populations from South Asia such as India and Pakistan, as well as China and the Philippines. As a result governments have not been able to control the movement of racialized people across borders; as an alternative, governments have imposed policies that restrict movement within national labour market rather than between. Sharma's analysis provides evidence that foreign migration programs are not created solely for the purpose of benefiting Canada's economy; in fact there are political motivations for the decisions made by immigration authorities. Although officially, the Conservative government and governments before it may have made the claim that their motivations for temporary foreign worker programs have been mainly economic, TFW programs serve other functions as well.

Basok (2003, 2004) further explores the link between citizenship and migrant labour by examining the case of "post-national" citizenship. Advocates of the post-national citizenship theory argue that the concept of rights has shifted from being state-based to individual-based, using the evidence of the emergence of supra-national organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the International Labour Organization (ILO), and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). Such organizations have allowed for sharp distinctions between citizen and non-citizen to weaken as immigrants are increasingly gaining access to social, civic, and political rights. Basok (2003) disputes the idea of post-national citizenship, arguing that accessibility to the rights given by the state and supra-national entities is dependent on whether or not migrants are afforded social membership by the host society. Hennebry (2006) contends that even with the existence of international organizations, migrants do not have many

protections as very few countries have signed and ratified international conventions pertaining to migrant rights. The countries that have signed international conventions are typically migrant sending countries while receiving countries have largely ignored the conventions.

The construction of the “Canadian citizen” is also linked to political economy literature. Flexibility is important for corporations in the global economy because it allows them to maximize profits while at the same time minimize obstacles. These obstacles include “trade tariffs, government regulations, underused labour, and trade union organization” (Barndt, 2002: p.219). In order to create a flexible and “reliable” workforce, citizenship rights are granted or withheld from migrant workers, which serves to create vulnerable and exploitable workers for states that use migrant labour (Preibisch, 2007a, 2007b). Of course citizenship rights are mainly afforded to those who are constructed as deserving of these rights, which are legal citizens of the state (Baines & Sharma, 2002).

The process to exclude SAWs from settling permanently in Canada begins at the recruitment stage. Male labourers are required to prove they have dependents at home who are not able to enter the country along with the worker at any point unless they qualify under the program as well. It has been theorized that this strategy guarantees that men cannot marry Canadian women and thus attain legal status. They are also deemed less likely to stay in Canada illegally past the expiry date of their visas if they have obligations to financially support families in their native countries (Preibisch, 2007a).

Women are usually recruited on a different set of criteria. Barndt (2002) states that up until 1998 only single mothers who were separated, widowed, or divorced could

apply for the SAWP. The fears were that single women might marry Canadian men and that married women without children might leave their husbands. Barndt does not comment on the assumptions about men and women made on the part of Mexican liaisons. The beliefs are interesting in that it is deemed married women might leave their spouses whereas men were likely to return home to their spouses. It is evident that the nature of masculinity and femininity is being judged differently. Currently the rules are the same for men and women but recruiters still mainly choose unmarried women (Barndt, 2002; Colby, 1997).

Researchers have not adequately addressed the gendered aspects of the SAWP. Among the literature, only a few articles discuss the plight of female migrants specifically, and all studies involve Mexican women, thus leaving out Jamaican and other Caribbean women (Barndt, 2002; Barron, 1999; Becerril, 2007; Preibisch & Santamaria, 2006). The small percentage of female SAWP workers has often been used as justification for the lack of research on this particular group, however it is important to factor women in as the SAWP is a highly gendered program given that mainly men perform agricultural work here. This impacts the roles women take on in Mexico and the Caribbean as their husbands are gone for the majority of the year (Colby, 1997). Preibisch and Santamaria (2006) describe the masculinization of the SAWP as a result of prescribed gender roles in Mexico where women are discouraged to migrate for employment, as their proper role is traditionally in the home doing care work while men act as primary (and sole) breadwinners. They add that employers must provide male and female workers with separate housing which can be expensive, and thus this requirement acts as a disincentive. The Pilot Project for low-skill workers may change the total

number of female migrant agricultural workers as the employer does not have any obligation to provide onsite housing for employees (FARMS, 2010).

In addition, women may not be accepted into this sector because they have traditionally performed other types of labour which have been beneficial for international labour markets. The ILO reports that women are usually streamed into the service sector which is traditionally undervalued because caring for others is deemed to be a 'natural' skill for women, rather than something that is acquired and learned through socialization (Barndt, 2002; Chammartin, 2008). Female migrants in Canada are mainly employed in low status occupations such as domestic workers, nurses for the elderly, entertainers, hotel cleaners, and sex workers, which are all construed as low-skill (Chammartin, 2008). The government utilizes large numbers of female labourers in the Live-In Caregiver program which is a program for domestic workers (Satzewich, 2007). The LCP is similar to the SAWP in that domestic workers are required to live with their employers during their contracts and therefore are often under the watch of their employers at all times (Satzewich, 1990; Sweetman & Warman, 2010; Trumper & Wong, 2010). The majority of workers entering under the LCP originate from the Philippines, indicating that women's household work is becoming racialized, which allows white Western women to pursue their careers, as the domestic work is handed off to Third World women (Trumper & Wong, 2010).² Although the LCP has received academic attention that focuses on

² The LCP is similar to the SAWP in that employees must reside at the employer's home during the period of employment. However, domestic workers are given the opportunity to apply for permanent residence after two years of continuous employment. SAWs on the contrary are not able to apply for permanent residence regardless of the number of years spent working in Canada. Thus agricultural migrants are at a higher disadvantage in some ways as they are forced to either accept the mechanisms of the SAWP or seek employment in their home countries (Hennebry, 2006; Satzewich, 1990).

how the program is gendered, the SAWP has yet to receive an adequate analysis of how gender shapes the way in which the program functions. There also needs to be an analysis of how gender affects female SAWs and the women that stay home while their partners are in Canada.

Once the recruitment stage has been completed, migrants continue to face barriers to permanent settlement in Canada. As temporary workers without citizenship status, SAWs are not entitled to social and political rights held by citizens. Nonetheless, SAWs are afforded some rights by the Canadian government, however these rights are often withheld for a variety of reasons, which will be explored shortly. The Supreme Court of Canada has extended these rights on the basis of Section 15 in the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, which gives protection against discrimination on the basis of categories such as gender, race, religion, etc. This section has also been interpreted by the Court to include non-citizenship, as it is a category that is “analogous” to the characteristics mentioned in the aforementioned categories (Gibb, 2006; NAALC, 2002).

The rights that are guaranteed to SAWs include protection against workplace discrimination, minimum wage, overtime and vacation pay, the right to refuse unsafe work, worker’s compensation, employment insurance (EI), pensions, adequate housing, and access to legal aid. However most categories have restrictions in place that limit the number of SAWs that are guaranteed these rights. In addition these rights are not guaranteed in every province and restrictions differ among provinces (NAALC, 2002).

Many workers fail to claim benefits such as vacation pay, EI, or pensions because they are unaware of their entitlement these benefits. Although researchers have acknowledged that workers lack an understanding of their rights and entitlements, they have neglected to

find out why the Caribbean and Mexican governments do not inform workers of these rights prior to arrival in Canada. Basok (2004) has explored why SAWs are unaware of their rights once they arrive in Canada, which will be addressed later on in this review, yet she has failed to find out why this information is not made available by someone other than the employer.

An Employment Agreement is signed by both the employer and employee prior to arrival in Canada, which stipulates the responsibilities of both parties. However it is difficult to enforce the Agreement legally as there has not been a legal case put forth from a worker claiming a violation of this document. In addition, workers are unlikely to be able to get representation in Canada as they are in the country temporarily. The problem becomes even more hopeless and difficult if a worker is repatriated (Verma, 2003).

➤ Despite the protections afforded to SAWs in the Employment Agreement, employers continue to deny workers these rights as a direct result of their non-citizenship status regardless of the law. Once workers are accepted into the program and arrive in Canada, they are required to live at their employers' homes creating exploitative, dependent and paternalistic relationships between employer and employees. Employers have the freedom to establish 'farm rules' in regards to leaving the farm and consequently control the mobility of employees as they supply workers with transportation either by making bikes available or by driving workers into the city to do their shopping and socialization (Preibisch, 2004, 2007b; Wall, 1992). Mexican workers in particular do not have the time or opportunity to learn English and often rely on their employers in assisting them with filling out government forms (Basok, 2004; Preibisch, 2007b).

Living arrangements and dependency on the employer for many forms of knowledge, has resulted in a plethora of violations of the rights afforded to SAWs. Workers often labour long hours from anywhere between fourteen to sixteen hours per day with one day off per week. During peak and harvesting seasons workers report that they work seven days a week without any compensation or overtime pay for longer hours (Basok, 2003, 2004; Smart, 1997; Wall, 1992). Workers accept long hours for the economic incentives although numerous costs are deducted from their wages including cost of room and board, EI, Canadian Pension and some airfare and administration costs (Colby, 1997; Preibisch, 2004).

Minimum standards for housing accommodations for workers have also been established which address matters such as ventilation, water supply, bathing facilities, cleanliness and sanitation, and sewage (NAALC, 2002). Housing must be provided free of cost to the worker and must be inspected by an agent from the Ministry of Health prior to the arrival of the SAWs. However adequate housing is often not provided and for the most part, living accommodations are not inspected unless complaints are made by an employee (Downes, 2007; Gibb, 2006). There are numerous examples within the literature of workers complaining about the state of the living quarters provided by farmers. For example, Smart (1997) found among her sample of research subjects that nine workers were living in the same room with broken windows, damp floors, poor bathing and kitchen facilities, and a broken washer and dryer. Gibb's (2006) study reveals that the main housing problems include small rooms, lack of privacy, small closets, and fridges that are too small. Some housing did not have indoor plumbing.

Downes (2007) also found that overcrowding, small fridges, and lack of privacy are prevalent problems among housing for SAWs.

Up until June 2006, SAWs were not covered under health and safety legislation under provincial law. The health and safety provisions were extended to SAWs after the United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW) union began a legal battle based on the *Charter* (UFCW, 2002). This is significant for the sector as farm work has a number of hazards, which include exposure to toxic pesticides, herbicides, large animals, extreme temperatures, various falling hazards and machines (Gibb, 2006; Verma, 2003).

Workplace accidents are not uncommon and workers may suffer health issues from lack of sleep and long hours (Gibb, 2006). Prior to 2006, employers did not have to adhere to policies that require proper safety training for employees, or offer workers' compensation. Therefore many workers did not receive proper training in regard to the use of machines such as tractors, ploughs, and harvesters. They were also not informed about the dangerous effects of farm chemicals (Gibb, 2006). Gibb's (2006) sample reveals that 34 per cent of workers admitted to working in fields that had recently been sprayed with pesticides, only 15 per cent were trained about the proper use of chemicals, and 10 per cent wore special clothing and masks during chemical application (22). However it has yet to be researched to see what, if any effect this Act has had on the working conditions of migrant farm workers.

The piece of legislation that covers workplace health and safety is the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*. If the *Act* is violated workers are given the right to refuse to perform the allotted task. Officially employers are legally prohibited from retaliating against a worker who refuses to perform a dangerous task. If injuries occur,

workers are required to see a physician who is required to report the accidents to the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board (WSIB). However, due to language barriers, physicians are often unable to understand the source of the problem (Basok, 2003).

Although retaliation on the part of employers is prohibited, in practice employers do react with the threat of repatriation. The threat of repatriation is used as a control mechanism to ensure workers comply with the employer's wishes. Workers can be sent home with only one or two days notice for becoming sick, questioning safety procedures, or refusing unsafe work altogether (Basok, 2004; Preibisch, 2007a; UFCW, 2007; Verma, 2003). The SAWP agreement states that once a trial period of two weeks has expired, "the employer is entitled to terminate the worker's employment for 'non-compliance, refusal to work, or any other sufficient reason' and thus cause the worker to be repatriated" (NAALC, 2002: 17). It is important to note that definitions for "sufficient reason" are not provided, leaving the interpretation up entirely to employers (Verma, 2003).

This policy entirely benefits employers as it allows farmers to avoid filing worker's compensation forms and it solves the problem of being understaffed as a result of illness. In addition there is currently no appeal process for workers who are repatriated, which creates an environment of fear for workers that are harmed on the job or become ill in some way (Gibb, 2006; UFCW, 2007). Studies show that workers often comply with unsafe working conditions, fail to report injuries, and withstand verbal abuse to avoid being repatriated (Basok, 2004; Downes, 2007; Gibb, 2006; Preibisch, 2004, 2007a; UFCW, 2007; Verma, 2003). Despite the threat of being sent home, Russell's (2007) research shows that the rate of repatriation of Jamaican workers is relatively low.

He finds that 34 workers were sent home between 2004 and 2005 and 51 were sent home between 2005 and 2006. Thus approximately 88 per cent of workers finished their contracts in 2004/2005 and 92 per cent finished in 2005/2006 (17). Unfortunately Russell fails to provide the reader with the reasons for repatriation; therefore it is difficult to judge whether or not there are valid reasons for sending workers home before the end of their contracts.

To further complicate matters, workers are not legally able to unionize in order to address any of the aforementioned violations. The justification used for the denial of bargaining rights has been the argument that farming is seasonal and that farms are generally small and family run making collective bargaining incompatible with these types of farms (Wall, 1992). Sharma (2006) adds that because the workers in the program rotate so frequently, it becomes challenging for workers to form groups. The UFCW launched a constitutional challenge that went to the Supreme Court arguing on the basis that farm workers were not given freedom of association which is guaranteed under the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (Preibisch, 2004; Verma, 2003: 27). In response to the UFCW's challenge, the Ontario government created the *Agricultural Employees Protection Act* in 2003 rather than extending the *Ontario Labour Relations Act* to SAWP workers, which would give them the right to unionize (Verma, 2003). Preibisch (2004) and the UFCW (2002) argue that the *Agricultural Act* was created merely to appease the UFCW's demands as it allows workers to form employee associations. These associations do not have any legal bearing and therefore do not require employers to bargain or negotiate with employees (Preibisch, 2004; UFCW, 2002).

If workers were able to unionize, they may also have representation when the Employment Agreement is reviewed. It is reviewed annually and negotiated if necessary by participating states. Anyone representing migrant workers or worker rights is not given permission to attend the meetings. However FARMS is able to attend meetings and bargain on behalf of farmer interests (Verma, 2003). SAWs do not have any opportunity to make a contribution to the employment agreement that they are entering, unlike many other agreements between employers and their workers. The UFCW has participated in workshops with representatives from Jamaica and Barbados and has discussed concerns about housing and the health and safety of workers (UFCW, 2007). Although this a good initial step, the UFCW has yet to enter negotiations with FARMS and official government personnel in meetings pertaining to making changes to the Agreement.

In the event that there are disagreements or disputes between workers and employers, the official mediator in this situation is a Liaison Officer. Before the UFCW became involved with the SAWP, the Liaison Officer was the only person available to migrant farm workers when they needed aid with disputes. Preibisch (2007b) and Verma (2003) argue that the role of the liaison is problematic because he or she has a dual role: to defend migrant workers and to ensure that the country being represented by the agent secures work placements. Verma (2003) asserts that given the government agent's dual role, he or she cannot adequately defend the worker's rights because it jeopardizes the sending country as the employer has the freedom to switch the source country. Downes' (2007) research shows when SAWs make complaints to liaison officers, their concerns go unheard because the officers are often unavailable. Verma's (2003) research indicates

that the offices of most liaisons are located in urban Toronto, Ontario and generally far away from farming communities where SAWs are employed. Aside from the UFCW, migrant farm workers do not have independent representation whenever conflicts arise; even then, the UFCW can only intervene to a certain degree and is not able to prevent employers from repatriating workers for unjust reasons.

Basok (2003, 2004) states that fear of repatriation is not the only reason impeding workers from exercising their legal rights. She finds that social exclusion from the host society contributes to the lack of accessibility to rights. Basok argues that in order to understand one's oppression, an individual must be aware of the laws that serve to oppress him or her and must be able to translate that understanding verbally. Without any knowledge of the legal system or ability to speak English, workers do not have the resources to rectify their injustices. Therefore, employers' ability to deny workers of such resources upholds their own power over the migrant workforce.

Numerous studies (Basok, 2003,2004; Colby, 1997; Preibisch, 2004, 2007a; Smart, 1997) have shown that workers are often isolated from the communities in which they live both physically, in terms of the remote locations of their homes on farms, as well as socially. They are dependent on the grower for transportation and therefore are not able to travel to far destinations on bicycles. Some farmers create rules where workers are not permitted to spend the night in another location (Preibisch, 2004). The long hours do not allow for time to socialize and workers often refrain from socialization in order to save money (Preibisch, 2004, 2007a). Colby's (1997) research compared Mexican workers who are employed in Canada and the U.S finding that many Mexican workers returned to the U.S. complaining that the employment in Canada is solely

focused on work, whereas the U.S. has a large Spanish speaking community and better opportunities for socialization.

Language barriers are another major factor as to why workers are isolated from the greater community, as most Mexicans are not able to speak English. Workers do not have time to learn English given the long hours they are given to work. The only interaction workers have with the general community are the days when they are taken into town to do their shopping and banking (Basok 2004; Gibb, 2006).

Despite the lack of integration or acceptance by the larger community, Bauder et. al. (2002) and Gibb (2006) find that SAWs are increasingly becoming more important to local economies because the workers are not able to travel very far to spend money elsewhere. SAWs utilize local businesses such as restaurants, grocery stores, and second-hand retailers. Gibb (2006) reports that SAWs spend approximately \$1,500 on gifts, clothes, food, and toys and a total of \$82 million in rural towns every year (18). Hennebry (2008) adds that banks and credit unions also make a profit on the transfer of remittances due to the cost of money orders that cost about \$35 for any order under \$1000. The ways in which businesses function and the products they sell, have been tailored to fit the needs of migrant farm workers. Bauder and his colleagues report that stores have begun to sell tortillas, hot sauces, bulk spices, coconut milk and other various items that are regularly used by Caribbean or Mexican workers. Storeowners report that they have become dependent on sales to SAWs and have the highest sales during peak harvesting seasons when the majority of migrants are employed (Bauder et. al., 2002). Banks have begun to operate longer hours and have created new services targeting SAWs. Hennebry (2008) reports that Western Union is the predominant service provider

through which workers send remittances back home. There are smaller companies that attempt to attract the business of migrant workers, however they are often not located in smaller, rural areas and are not able to compete with Western Union.

Hennebry's (2008) research on the migration industry surrounding the SAWP shows that local business and banks are not the only beneficiaries. Other actors in the industry include lawyers, agents, recruitment organizations, coyotes (SAWP middlemen) and other intermediaries such as airlines and telephone companies. For example, Mexican SAWs often use recruiters in their home countries who offer "guaranteed" space in the program for approximately Cdn \$80. Workers also frequently purchase calling cards or use pay phones to speak to their families at home. Hennebry (2008) notes that it has yet to be determined if the migration industry is beneficial for SAWs. She states that migrants absorb the entire cost for information and communication technologies, while at the same time intermediaries stand to profit from the migration process. She argues that the entire benefit gained is from FARMS as they collect fees from SAWs, CanAg Travel, the airline that transports SAWs, Western Union, and phone card companies such as GoodCall and VIGO. These companies do not have a great deal of competition and thus have a monopoly on the services they provide to SAWs.

Basok (2003) compares permanent residents and migrant workers stating that although many newly arrived immigrants suffer the same type of isolation in Canadian communities, they differ from migrant workers in that they have a variety of services aimed at them. For example they are given English classes, and settlement orientations by a variety of governmental and non-governmental settlement agencies and departments. These are intended to aid permanent residents into Canadian society. These services are

not extended to SAWs who are non-citizens, although there are improvements being made in regard to services for migrant workers.

Given that SAWs suffer from social exclusion, they are thus excluded from knowledge about the rights that they do have. Although SAWs pay various government fees and taxes, they are not able to claim most social program benefits (Sharma, 2006). For example they have the right to a pension, health care, EI, and income tax returns (UFCW, 2007). Many underutilize health coverage, and often pay for prescription drugs even though they pay into a drug plan. Researchers also find that many workers pay into the EI program without being able to reap the benefits of the program in times of need. In order to receive EI payments in periods of unemployment, workers must accumulate 420-700 hours in order to claim the benefits. Although some workers are able to acquire the required number of hours, many are not able to do so, yet they are still required to pay into the program. In addition, the worker must be in Canada and willing to work, which is nearly impossible considering that SAWs must return home once a contract expires (Verma, 2003). The Ontario government has profited from EI payments from migrant workers who are unable to use them. In 2001, SAWs contributed \$3.4 million to the EI premium and in March 2002 the Canadian government had a surplus of \$40 billion in the Employment Insurance Account that has been used to pay the national debt (Verma, 2003). Sharma (2006) adds that the federal government has accumulated a large sum of money resulting from a non-refundable processing fee of \$100 that is charged when workers enter Canada. Workers paid \$11 million into social programs between 1973 and 1981 and were not given access to most programs.

Basok (2004) notes that conditions are improving for migrant agricultural workers in Canada in terms of the number of services available to them. UFCW has opened up seven migrant worker support centers throughout the country. Some of the services offered are assistance in pleas for help in repatriation cases, assistance with filing worker compensation claims and appeals, translation requests, obtaining health cards, and filing insurance claims (UFCW, 2007).

Basok (2004), Preibisch (2004), and Gibb (2006) report that churches have established outreach programs as well such as the Niagara Caribbean Workers Outreach Program in Niagara and the Free Reformed Church of Vineland. Civil organizations have also emerged such as Justicia 4 Migrants in Toronto, Global Justice Care Van Project, and the Community of Agricultural Foreign Workers and Friends of Exeter which offer language training, health and safety training, and assistance in filing work compensation forms and other documents. Unfortunately most of these services are only located in areas where there are large numbers of SAWs such as Leamington, which leaves out more remote areas where fewer numbers of SAWs are employed (Preibisch, 2004).

The Economic Impact of Remittances on Mexico and Caribbean Countries

The previous sections have outlined the ways in which the SAWP has benefited the Canadian agricultural sector by providing farmers with a form of cheap and reliable labour that has enabled the sector to flourish. However, the SAWP was formed to benefit both the Canadian state as well as the other participating countries as stated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Canadian government and the

Jamaican and Mexican governments. In addition to meeting Canada's economic goals the stated purpose of the SAWP includes the intention of improving "the economic welfare of migrant workers" (Verma, 2003: 6) by giving foreign workers access to better paying employment and reducing the risks involved with illegal migration (Aceytuno & Greenhill, 1999; Russell, 2007). In fact, the allowance of migrant workers in the country is viewed by the Canadian government as a form of international aid to Mexico and Caribbean states (Colby, 1997).

Remittances are important for Caribbean countries and Mexico given that they represent a significant amount of the GDP (UFCW, 2007). Migrant remittances amount to roughly 10% of the GDP for Mexico with C\$70 million coming in each year. The percentages for the Caribbean range from 3-10% across the islands except for Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago (Downes, 2007; Hennebry, 2006; Preibisch, 2007b).³ Gross earnings for Jamaican migrants were C\$31.63 million in 2001, which amounted to an insignificant 0.26% of the GDP. The total amount of remittances under the *Compulsory Savings Scheme* in the same year was C\$6.93 million although this number has increased considerably to C\$9.77 million in 2006 (Russell, 2007: 13). Russell (2007) reminds the reader that although these numbers seem insignificant on the macroeconomic level, they are considerable for individual households, which allow families to improve their own, and their children's, educational opportunities as well as overall living conditions. This in turn affects the community and the Jamaican population on the whole.

³ The remittance amount for Caribbean countries is based on the research of Andrew Downes (2007) whose focus was on Trinidad and Tobago and seven islands of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS). Trinidad and Tobago's remittances amounted to 0.4%-1% by 2003. A detailed chart of remittances sent to each individual island except Jamaica can be found in the original source.

Mexican and Caribbean governments continue to support the program despite its problems because remittances arguably contribute to economic development (Downes, 2007; Verma, 2003). A definition of development is helpful for this discussion as it gives the reader an idea of the changes that must occur as a result of migrant incomes. The definition used for the purposes of this paper is drawn from Basok who classifies the term as the “generation of employment and increase in agricultural production, as well as [...] increase in average income, and decrease in inequality” (2003: 3-4). Colby’s (1997) research on Mexican migrants reveals that the country aims to benefit from the program by alleviating household poverty, and by providing workers with the opportunity to learn Canadian agricultural methods and technology, and proceed to use this knowledge to improve agricultural techniques in Mexico. Russell (2007) shows that several of Jamaica’s goals are to increase investments within rural communities which could ultimately lead to development in those rural areas, and to “invest indirectly in human resource development of rural youth” by decreasing the unemployment rate and improving the quality of life for SAWP participants (3).

Although a number of researchers have focused on the program from a political economy perspective (Basok, 2000; Preibisch, 2007b; Satzewich, 1990, 1991; Smart, 1997; Wall, 1992, 1994) the study of the link between developmental impact and remittances has largely been ignored. Most research includes a small section on remittances and their micro-level impact on families within larger studies and fails to focus on remittances alone (Colby, 1997; Downes, 2007; Gibb, 2007; Russell, 2007; Smart, 1997). However there is a body of literature that centers on the link between remittances, development, and migration programs, although it does not refer specifically

to the SAWP; instead much of the literature on Mexican migrants' remittances is U.S. based, given the high number of people that migrate to the United States.

Thus far, Basok (2000, 2002, 2003) has been the sole researcher on issues relating to remittances and the Canadian SAWP. Statistics show that remittances on average amount to approximately C\$6,000-\$8,000 (U.S. \$5,500-\$7,500) per season per worker. This number is based upon an eight-month employment contract and changes depending on the number of weeks spent in Canada (Basok, 2000, 2002; Smart, 1997). In Mexico this salary amounts to five to six years worth of employment (Basok, 2002). Colby (1997) compared the earning of Mexican migrants in Canada and the U.S., finding Mexican migrant farm workers in Canada earn approximately \$1000 per month while U.S. workers make \$200 per month on average. These wages are significant for SAWs considering that for some employees, the total income received from one day's work in Canada translates into one month's worth of earnings in the sending country (Smart, 1997).

The documented use of remittances varies, and includes an assortment of items and services. Wages have been used to pay for food, clothing, medicine, children's education, buy, improve or expand homes, pay off debts, increase consumption in the local economy (household appliances, cars, trucks, social and religious activities), purchase tools for their trade at home, and a smaller amount of migrants make productive investments by purchasing businesses, livestock, and agricultural land (Basok, 2003, 2002, 2000; Colby, 1997; Smart, 1997).

The transfer of skills and technology can also be viewed as a form of remittance of knowledge. Familiarity with good agricultural techniques has the potential to increase

the human capital of migrants within their own country which will enable them to access better paying jobs in their home countries. Downes (2007) and Gibb (2007) have found there is very little skill transfer from Canada to the Caribbean or Mexico. In Jamaica the skill set of Jamaican participants is not based in the agricultural sector and therefore the skills are mismatched once they migrate to Canada to work on farms. As a result when they return home, they are unable to put their farming skills into use, given the type of employment they are able to obtain in their home countries (Downes, 2007; Russell, 2007). An in depth investigation is necessary to understand why SAWs are not able to transfer the skills they acquire in Canada. This may be due to lack of farming jobs in sending countries or lack of access to particular equipment and technology.

Unfortunately there is currently a paucity of research on the topic to be able to make predictions.

Productive investment in particular has been of interest to researchers in assessing whether a development is affected by remittances within sending countries. The present discussion will initially focus on productive investment activities of SAWs and will then proceed to include the larger academic debate on whether remittances contribute to development. Basok's 2003 study found productive investment does not occur on a large scale. For instance in her 1996 sample, she found that only 60 out of 255 Mexican SAWs were able to make productive investments (Basok, 2000: 89). Several years after the initial study in 1996, Basok carried out further interviews with an additional 311 SAWs and found that out of the total number of participants during the various stages of her research, only 141 workers (out of 565) invested in land or business (Basok, 2002: 134). The purchases included shoe stores, farms, livestock, shoe stores, taxis, tire shops, tailor's

shops, blacksmith shops, and a clothing store, and construction equipment among others (Basok, 2000).

Several factors make it more likely that a worker is able to be involved in productive activities. Return migration is a key factor as the likelihood of productive investment increased with longer participation as the basic family needs have been met. Families in earlier cycles with younger children are able to accumulate a disposable income during the time children are in elementary school in order to pay for school beyond the eighth grade for secondary and post-secondary education (Basok, 2000; Colby, 1997). Other factors that enable migrants to purchase land or shops are access to education (and therefore the knowledge to run a business), the ownership of land or business prior to migration, living in an urban or semi-urban area that has a sufficient infrastructure, access to markets, fertile soil, and is in the process of development (Basok 2000, 2003; Durrand et. al., 1996).

In the Mexican case, barriers to productive investment exist due to the criteria that the Mexican government recruiters require for successful applicants. Given that one of the goals of the program is to alleviate household poverty, recruiters choose the poorest and neediest workers with the least likelihood of gaining adequate employment in Mexico to migrate to Canada. Therefore workers are mainly uneducated, do not own farmland or a business, and are married with multiple children (Basok, 2000, 2004; Colby, 1997). Furthermore, migrants are unwilling to purchase farmland or business primarily because they are absent from their country of origin for the majority of the year and are not able to maintain the farm or shop. Workers who do buy land often rely on their children, who are mainly sons to either produce crops or drive taxis for example.

This is primarily an option for families with older children who are able to work the land (Basok 2000).

However even with these barriers, SAWs in Canada fare better than their U.S. counterparts. Colby (1997) compared investment and consumption goals of migrant farm workers in Canada and the U.S. finding that SAWs were able to meet their targets much quicker than those employed in the U.S. The reasons for this being that workers receive higher wages, have paid transportation and housing, job security, and little opportunity to socialize and thus spend money, therefore enabling workers to save their incomes.

There is a larger academic debate regarding productive investment, remittances, and development that requires some review. The parameters of this paper do not allow for an extensive analysis of this debate; however, it is important to address this ongoing discussion in order to determine whether or not remittances are economically benefiting migrant workers and sending countries. There are two opposing views on how remittances affect development that Binford (2003) terms as the structuralist position or the “migrant syndrome” that was popular during the 1970s and 1980s and the functionalist position or the new economics of labour migration theory (NELM) that researchers since the 1990s have been taking (Taylor, 1999).

The chief structuralist theorist is Josua Reichert, who in 1981 argued that Mexican households were in a cycle of dependency on the incomes they earned from migrating to the United States. He argued that their money was overwhelmingly spent on consumption and therefore migrants were not able to become economically self-sufficient after any period of time throughout the migration process (Binford, 2003). Other researchers such as Raymond Wiest and Richard Mines agreed with Reichert and

theorized that although migrants were able to acquire goods, services, and a general higher standard of living, these things could only be sustained by further migration. Thus productive investments could not be made and communities were not able to reap the benefits from remittances in terms of development (Binford, 2003; Durrand et. al., 1996; Taylor 1999).

In the early 1990s, Durrand and Massey (1992) reviewed almost 40 community studies on remittances to Mexico and found the researchers were unanimous in that they viewed the problem from a dependency perspective. The authors challenge these assumptions by arguing that previous academics have failed to consider the indirect impact of remittances on local communities. Although remittances may be spent largely on consumption in Mexico and other remittance receiving countries, this creates a multiplier effect, which consequently creates an increased demand for production in the manufacturing sector and transportation industry for example. Therefore more jobs become available, stimulating the national economy (Basok, 2003; Durrand & Massey 1992; Durrand et. al., 1996; Taylor 1999). In the future researchers may critically analyze how they define the term “investment.” Structuralists do not define the transfer of monies toward educational attainment to constitute investment while the functionalists would argue otherwise.

Estimates show that Mexico receives approximately \$2 billion in migradollars, which are multiplied by 3.25 times over time and thus increase the original number of remittances to \$6.5 billion (Durrand et. al., 1996: 432). Taylor’s (1999) research yielded similar results, finding that in terms of individual households, for small farmers, \$1 in remittances increased to \$0.29-\$0.38 and for urban workers, there was an increase of

\$1.11 in their incomes (70). However researchers such as Taylor (1999), Durrand et. al. (1996), Durrand and Massey (1992), Gardezi (1995), Hennebry (2006), and Stalker (2000) point out that the level of impact is dependent upon the local economy of sending countries. Without quality land, infrastructure, services, and an expanding economy, it is idealistic to believe that any amount of remittances will enable migrants to invest money productively or be able to use skills gained in Canada. Thus the sociocultural and economic conditions of migrants' homes must not be excluded (Gardezi, 1995).

Basok's (2003) research on the SAWP and development contradicted this conclusion and found workers from the least developed parts of Mexico were more likely to invest productively. In the worst endowed communities that did not have paved roads or telephone poles, 23% of the study participants had purchased agricultural land while only 15% of migrants in well endowed communities purchased land (14). She argues researchers have ignored a crucial factor in determining whether or not migrants invest productively which is the price of land in relation to purchasing power. In Mexico unirrigated land is significantly less expensive than irrigated land thus making it more affordable for migrants who live in areas with such land. Agricultural land around well-endowed communities is the most expensive and therefore SAWs are not able to save enough money to purchase any, while those in substandard communities are able to acquire farm property.

The study on remittances and the SAWP remain limited and must be further explored. A starting point for further research can be examining the link between development and remittance monies as Basok has accomplished. Hennebry (2006) provides a useful recommendation for Basok by stating the need for her analysis to

include how and if rural migrants sustain land once they have purchased it, and ultimately how development is sustained on a larger scale within the community.

Another research gap that must be filled is to explore how remittances affect social and political relationships in the community once some families have increased their incomes as participants of the SAWP while others remain in poverty. Does this disrupt community relationships or is the money used to support community events and social institutions?

Conclusion

The review of the literature has been able to adequately address the research questions posed at the beginning of this examination. It can thus be concluded that the need for SAWs arose since the 1940s because the agricultural sector became increasingly mechanized and consolidated. These changes eliminated a large number of family farms and increased the number of consolidated farms that became reliant on market forces, which in turn created a dependency on a paid labour force. Labour shortages among the domestic population combined with the need for timely harvesting, led employers to request foreign temporary labour from the Canadian government. However, it can be concluded that the program was not created merely in the interests of Canada's place in the global economy. In fact, in line with the political economy perspective, political motivations were taken into consideration along with the program's potential economic incentives. The Canadian government had resisted the creation of the SAWP for nearly twenty years because it was reluctant to allow racialized workers from Jamaica to enter the country. Immigration authorities finally allowed a small number of SAWs to come to

Canada once employers began using marginalized workers to supplement labour shortages, making the government appear incompetent in its ability to provide the farming sector with an adequate labour supply.

The SAWP functions mainly to serve employers' and the government's economic interests as the program contributes significantly to the agricultural sector's economic output. Workers are forced into positions of unfree labour which makes them a reliable and disposable workforce that is at the mercy of employer demands. However SAWs do benefit economically from the program as well, yet the benefit is predominantly gained by each individual worker and his family. It is unclear whether or not remittances are beneficial for Mexico and Caribbean countries, although there is research that indicates there may be a multiplier effect worker's remittances. Therefore the program still serves to be in favour of Canadian employers and the state as opposed SAWs and sending countries.

The body of research on the SAWP reveals a number of gaps that may be taken into consideration by future researchers. There continues to be a lack of investigation into remittances. Although there are a few studies that provide statistical information on remittances, these studies are often missing an analysis of whether or not monetary remittances are affecting not only families, but also the entire worker's country. There is a larger debate regarding the impact of remittance on sending countries, yet this debate has not been applied to the SAWP. Furthermore, research could address remittances of values and the social and political changes that occur in home countries once workers have been employed in Canada for a number of years. This would be particularly

interesting in regard to female SAWs, whose position as the breadwinner in the family may or may not affect gender roles at home.

Finally, researchers have also failed to address how the government's Low Skill Pilot Program will affect the recruitment of SAWs, given that employers are given more freedom with the Pilot Program in terms of flexibility with regulations such as choosing the source country. Employers are no longer forced to choose from two regions of the world and have the opportunity to threaten current employees and employee recruiters in Mexico and the Caribbean with a change in the source country. Currently there is no evidence on how the two programs affect one another.

APPENDIX A

Table 1.1

Total Number (and Percentage) of (Im)migrant Workers in the Canadian Labour Market by Calendar Year, Permanent Residents Destined to the Labour Market, and Temporary Migrant Workers, 1973–2004

Year	Destined (Immigrant Workers)	Visa ^a (Non-Immigrant, or Migrant, Workers)	Total (Im)migrant Workers ^b
1973	92,228 (57)	69,901 (43)	162,129 (100)
1974	106,083 (60)	71,773 (40)	177,856 (100)
1975	81,189 (51)	77,149 (49)	158,338 (100)
1976	61,461 (47)	69,368 (53)	130,829 (100)
1977	47,625 (41)	67,130 (59)	114,755 (100)
1978	34,762 (71)	14,459 (29)	49,221 (100)
1979	47,949 (60)	31,996 (40)	79,945 (100)
1980	63,479 (39)	98,681 (61)	162,160 (100)
1981	56,676 (37)	96,750 (63)	153,426 (100)
1982	55,023 (35)	101,509 (65)	156,532 (100)
1983	36,540 (29)	87,700 (71)	124,240 (100)
1984	37,468 (25)	113,297 (75)	150,765 (100)
1985	36,949 (22)	134,167 (78)	171,116 (100)
1986	63,479 (30)	150,467 (70)	213,946 (100)
1987	56,676 (26)	157,492 (74)	214,168 (100)
1988	73,134 (27)	194,454 (73)	267,588 (100)
1989	94,412 (36)	169,004 (64)	263,416 (100)
1990	109,840 (38)	176,377 (62)	286,217 (100)
1991	127,870 (40)	191,392 (60)	319,262 (100)
1992	137,360 (43)	178,280 (57)	315,640 (100)
1993	65,130 (30)	153,988 (70)	219,118 (100)
1994	109,165	n/a	n/a
1995	109,937 (47)	124,371 (53)	234,308 (100)
1996	118,725 (52)	110,871 (48)	229,596 (100)
1997	111,417 (46)	132,765 (54)	244,182 (100)
1998	90,766 (38)	150,149 (62)	240,915 (100)
1999	100,746 (38)	166,439 (62)	267,185 (100)
2000	120,856 (40)	179,569 (60)	300,425 (100)
2001	131,599 (41)	188,610 (59)	320,209 (100)
2002	118,147 (38)	196,409 (62)	314,556 (100)
2003	117,637 (37)	202,509 (63)	320,146 (100)
2004	124,829 (35)	228,677 (65)	353,506 (100)

Source: EIC, 1980–93; CIC, 1995; 2005; INTERCEDE, 1993, 1994.

^a 'Visa' refers to the number of people admitted to Canada and working in Canada during the calendar year recorded. The total number of migrant workers includes 'workers' (table 5.3) plus those in the Foreign Domestic Movement Program (1982–1991) and those in the Live-in Caregiver Program (1992–2004) (table 5.4). For the years 1989–1993, the category 'backlog clearance,' given to refugees granted temporary employment authorizations while waiting for their status to be determined, is also excluded

^b This category includes all those entering Canada under the above 'destined' and 'visa' categories.

(Sharma, 2006: 119)

References

- Aceytuno, J., & Greenhill D. (1999). Managed migration and the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program. *Working Paper Series, Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis*.
- Baines, D., & Sharma, N. (2002). "Migrant Workers as Non-Citizens: The Case Against Citizenship as a Social Policy Concept." *Studies in Political Economy* 69, 75-107.
- Barndt, D. (2002). *Tangled Routes: Women, Work, and Globalization the Tomato Trail*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press.
- Basok, T. (1999). Free to be unfree: Mexican guest workers in Canada. *Labour, Capital and Society*, 32(2), 192-221.
- Basok, T. (2000). "Migration of Mexican Seasonal Farm Workers to Canada and Development: Obstacles to Productive Investment." *International Migration Review* 34 (1), 79-97.
- Basok, T (2002). *Tortillas and Tomatoes: Transmigrant Mexican Harvesters in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Basok, T (2003). Mexican seasonal migration to Canada and development: A community-based comparison. *International Migration*, 41(2), 3-25.
- Basok, T (2004). "Post-National Citizenship, Social Exclusion, and Migrants' Rights: Mexican Seasonal Workers in Canada." *Citizenship Studies* 8 (1), 47-64.
- Barndt, D. (2002). *Tangled Routes: Women, Work, and Globalization the Tomato Trail*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press.
- Bauder, H., Preibisch, K., Sutherland, S., & Nash, K. (2002). *Impacts of Foreign Farm Workers in Ontario Communities*. Sustainable Rural Communities Program, OMAFRA.
- Becerril, O. "Transnational Work the Gendered Politics of Labour: A Study of Male and Female Mexican Migrant Workers in Canada." In Luin Goldring, & Sailaja Krishnamurti (Eds.). *Organizing the Transnational: Labour, Politics, and Social Change*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007: 157-172.
- Binford, Leigh (2003). "Migrant Remittances and (Under)Development in Mexico." *Critique of Anthropology* 23 (3): 305-336.

- Colby, C. (1997). "From Oaxaca to Ontario: Mexican Contract Labor in Canada and the Impact at Home." *California Institute for Rural Studies*. Davis: California Institute for Rural Studies.
- Downes, A. (2007). "The Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program: The Experience of Barbados, Trinidad, & Tobago and the OECS." Ottawa: North-South Institute.
- Durand, J., Parrado, E.A., & Massey, D.S. (1996). "Migradollars and Development: A Reconsideration of the Mexican Case." *International Migration Review*, 30 (2), 423-444.
- FARMS. (2010). "Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program (SAWP) and NOC C & D (Agricultural Low Skill) Comparison." Retrieved July 23, 2010 from <www.farmsontario.ca>
- Flecker, K. (2010). "Building a Disposable Workforce Through Temporary Migration Policy." *Canadian Issues: Temporary Foreign Workers*. Toronto: Metropolis, 99-103.
- Gardezi, H.N. (1995). "Introduction." *The Political Economy of International Labour Migration*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1-18.
- Gibb, H. (2006). *Farmworkers From Afar: Results from an International Study of Seasonal Farmworkers from Mexico and the Caribbean Working on Ontario Farms*. Ottawa: North-South Institute.
- Hennebry, J. (2008). "Bienvenidos a Canada? Globalization and the Migration Industry Surrounding Temporary Agricultural Migration in Canada." *Canadian Studies in Population*, 35 (2): 339-356.
- Hennebry, J. (2006). *Globalization and the Mexican-Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program: Power, Racialization, & Transnationalism in Temporary Migration*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Western Ontario, 2006).
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1995). "Globalization and the Future of the Nation State." *Economy and Society*, 24 (3): 408-42.
- Kacowicz, A.M. (2007). "Globalization, Poverty, and the North-South Divide." *International Studies Review*, 9 (4): 565-80.
- Kelley, N., & Trebilcock, M. (2000). *The Making of the Mosaic: A History of Canadian Immigration Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Nakache, D. (2010). "Temporary Workers: Permanent Rights?" *Canadian Issues: Temporary Foreign Workers*. Toronto: Metropolis, 45-49.
- Norberg-Hodge, H., Merrifield, T., & Gorelick, S. (2002). *Bringing the Food Economy Home: Local Alternatives to Global Agribusiness*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing Co. Ltd.
- North American Agreement on Labour Co-operation. (2002). *Protection of Migrant Agricultural Workers in Canada, Mexico, and the United States: Guide to Labour and Employment Laws for Migrant Workers*: NAALC.
- Preibisch, K. (2004). Migrant Agricultural Workers and Processes of Social Inclusion in Rural Canada: Encuentros and Desencuentros. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 29 (57-58): 203-239.
- Preibisch, K. (2007a) "Globalizing Work, Globalizing Citizenship: Community-Migrant Worker Alliance in Southwestern Ontario." In Luin Goldring, & Sailaja Krishnamurti (Eds.). *Organizing the Transnational: Labour, Politics, and Social Change*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 97-114.
- Preibisch, K. (2007b). "Local Produce, Foreign Labour: Labour Mobility Programs and Global Trade Competitiveness in Canada." *Rural Sociology*, 72(3), 418-450.
- Preibisch, K., & Santamaria, L.H. (2006). "Engendering Labour Migration: The Case of Foreign Workers in Canadian Agriculture." *Local, National, and Transnational Connections*. Vermont: Ashgate, 107-130.
- Russell, R. (2007). *Jamaican Workers' Participation in the Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program*. Ottawa: North-South Institute.
- Satzewich, V. (1990). "Rethinking Post-1945 Migration to Canada: Towards a Political Economy of Labour Migration." *International Migration*, 28 (3): 327-346.
- Satzewich, V. (1991). *Racism and the Incorporation of Foreign Labour: Farm Labour Migration to Canada Since 1945*. London: Routledge.
- Satzewich, V. (2007). "Business or Bureaucratic Dominance in Immigration Policymaking in Canada: Why was Mexico Included in the Caribbean Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program in 1974?" *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 8 (3): 255-276.
- Sharma, N. (2006). "Canada's Non-Immigrant Employment Authorization Program (NIEAP): The Social Organization of Unfreedom of 'Migrant Workers'." *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant Workers' in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Shields, J. (2004). "Corporate Globalization, the Agricultural Crisis, and the Restructuring of Rural Canada." *Social Studies Bulletin*, 72: 16-37.
- Shields, J. (1992). "The Capitalist State and Farm Labour Policy." In *Rural Sociology in Canada*. David A. Hay and Gurcharn S. Basran (Eds.). Toronto: Oxford University Press, 246-266.
- Siemiatycki, M. (2010). "Marginalizing Migrants: Canada's Rising Reliance on Temporary Foreign Workers." *Canadian Issues: Temporary Foreign Workers*. Toronto: Metropolis, 60-63.
- Smart, J. (1997). "Borrowed Men on Borrowed Time: Globalization, Labour Migration, and Local Economies in Alberta." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 38 (4): 415-439.
- Stalker, P. (2000). *Workers without frontiers : the impact of globalization on international migration*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Stasiulis, D., & Bakan, A. (2005). *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sweetman, A., & Casey Warman. (2010). "Canada's Temporary Foreign Workers Program." *Canadian Issues: Temporary Foreign Workers*. Toronto: Metropolis, 19-24.
- Trumpter, R., & Wong, L.L. (2010). "Temporary Workers in Canada: A National Perspective." *Canadian Issues: Temporary Foreign Workers*. Toronto: Metropolis, 83-89.
- UFCW Canada. (2007). *The Status of Migrant Farm Workers in Canada, 2006-2007*: UFCW Canada.
- Verma, V. (2003). "The Mexican and Caribbean Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program: Regulatory and Policy Framework, Farm Industry Level Employment Practices, and the Future of the Program under Unionization." *Canada's Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program as a Model of Best Practices in Migrant Worker Participation in the Benefits of Economic Globalization*. Ottawa: North-South Institute.
- Wall, E. (1994). "Farm Labour Markets and the Structure of Agriculture." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 31 (1): 65-?
- Wall, E. (1992). "Personal Labour Relations and Ethnicity in Ontario Agriculture." In Vic Satzewich (Ed.). *Deconstructing a Nation: Immigration, Multiculturalism and Racism in '90s Canada*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood: 261-275.

Weston, A., & Scarpa de Masellis, L. (2007). "Hemispheric Integration and Trade Relations – Implications for Canada's Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program." *Canada's Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program as a Model of Best Practices in Migrant Worker Participation in the Benefits of Economic Globalization*. Ottawa: North-South Institute.

Winson, A. (1993). *The Intimate Commodity: Food and the Development of the Agro-Industrial Complex in Canada*. Toronto: Garamond Press