

Redefining the Concept of Immigration in Canada

Margaret Michalowski
Demography Division
Statistics Canada

Abstract

In Canada, temporary movements of foreigners have so far been excluded from the system of international migration statistics, and consequently, from any demographic and socio-economic analysis of the impact of these movements on the socio-economic situation in the country. It is easy to recognize however, that these foreigners have an impact on society and the economy. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the trends and selectivity among foreign temporary residents in Canada. The study covers the period between 1981 and 1990, and is confined to the following characteristics: sex, age, marital status, occupation, place of destination, length of stay, and type of authorization to remain in Canada.

Résumé

Au Canada, les mouvements temporaires des étrangers ont jusqu'ici été exclus du système des statistiques de migrations internationales et, par conséquent, de toute analyse démographique et socio-économique de l'impact de ces mouvements sur la situation socio-économique du pays. Il est facile de reconnaître cependant, que ces étrangers influent sur la société et l'économie. Le présent article a pour objectif d'analyser les tendances et la sélectivité parmi les résidents temporaires étrangers au Canada. L'étude couvre la période de 1981 et 1990, et se limite aux caractéristiques suivantes : sexe, âge, état matrimonial, profession, lieu de destination, longueur du séjour et type d'autorisation de séjour au Canada.

Key Words: immigration, statistics collection, non-permanent resident

Introduction

The history of Canada proves that immigration has always been an important component of the country's demographic growth. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, more than ten million people have arrived in Canada with the intention of making it their country of permanent residence. Moreover, numerous studies have demonstrated that, to support the development of its economy, Canada has relied to a great extent on immigration (Kerr, 1986; Nash, 1987; De Vortez, 1989; Hawkins, 1989). Immigration policy in the past was mostly preoccupied with short-term demands attendant upon the economic situation. Recent immigration policy, however, seems to reflect an increased recognition of the importance of demographic concerns and the long-term impact of immigration on all

aspects of society (Samuel and Jansson, 1988). During the unfavourable economic climate of the beginning of the 1990s, a significant increase in immigration levels was announced for the 1991-1995 period, based on long-range considerations (Employment and Immigration Canada, 1990). At the same time, the economic dimension in the latest policy was not ignored. Announced changes signify a wider opening of the door for migrants, as they will be granted the right to permanent settlement on the basis of their labour market suitability.

The above shift in the focus in the conceptualization of Canadian immigration policy took place within the traditional definition of the international migration movement. In order to define this movement and categories of immigrants, Canada uses the concept of legal right to permanent residence and citizenship. According to this concept, only persons who have applied (from outside or within Canada) and were granted permanent resident status are considered as immigrants (Government of Canada, 1985). Persons entering Canada on the basis of possession of a document authorizing them to come and remain in Canada for a limited period of time, as well as Canadian citizens and returning permanent residents, are not considered to be immigrants. While these two categories of persons crossing the Canadian border are the subject of immigration policy, they are excluded from official Canadian international migration statistics. Their exclusion results in a lack of conformity of Canadian immigration and emigration statistics with the recommendations made in 1976 by the United Nations Statistical Commission (United Nations, 1980). The internal comparability of Canada's international migration statistics can also be questioned on the grounds that, while Canadian citizens and permanent residents staying abroad for at least one year are a component of estimates of emigration *from* Canada, they are not considered in immigration statistics when they decide to return *to* Canada.

Apart from these deficiencies, it seems that the Canadian concept of international migration does not reflect changing the realities of the late 1970s and 1980s. Since the late 1970s, the enormous expansion of travel for business and pleasure, and travel resulting from international cooperation and political pressures, have contributed to the transformation of migration patterns. Currently, thousands of people enter Canada for the purposes of study, work or authorized visits. Results from some studies lend evidence to an increase in the volume of return migration to Canada (Fortier, 1989). Also, a growing number of people seek refuge in Canada.

Some of the problems related to the lack of international comparability and internal inconsistency of Canadian migration statistics were subject of

discussions included in several publications (see for example: Beaujot and Rappak, 1986; Richmond and Kalback, 1980; Simmons, 1987). It seems that although not without shortcomings, the 1976 United Nations recommendations which draws from previously published recommendations made by the International Labour Organization in 1932 and the United Nations in 1949, are considered as the most comprehensive so far. On the immigration side, the following categories of arrivals are identified:

Long-term immigrants, defined as persons who have entered the country with the intention of remaining for more than one year and who meet one of the two additional qualifications below

Short-term immigrants, defined as persons (excluding border workers who regularly cross the border to work daily or slightly less frequently) who have entered the country with the intention of remaining for one year or less for the purpose of working at an occupation remunerated from within the country and their dependents and domestic employees who have accompanied them or come to join them, each of whom must meet one of the two additional qualifications below

Additional qualifications for all (long-term and short-term) immigrants: In addition to the above qualifications, all immigrants must never have been in the country continuously for more than one year or, having been in the country at least once continuously for more than one year, must have been away continuously for more than one year since their last stay of more than one year.

Short-term emigrants returning, defined as persons (excluding border workers) who have entered the country, who had previously been in the country at least once continuously for more than one year and not away continuously for more than one year since the last stay of more than one year, and whose last departure was to work abroad at an occupation remunerated from a foreign country or to accompany or join such a person as a dependent or a domestic employee.

Nomads who have entered the country with the intention of remaining for a fairly fixed portion of one year (excluding those who enter and depart frequently with no fixed pattern).

Exceptions: Even though they would otherwise meet the requirements of categories 1) and 2) above, diplomatic and consular representatives and members of the armed forces of the country and of foreign countries should not be classified as immigrants. Persons accompanying or coming to join

them as dependents or domestic employees should also not be classified as immigrants" (United Nations, 1980:5-7).

Thus, the recommendation criteria for identification of immigrants are based on the length of stay in or the absence from a country and the purpose of travel (work for remuneration). In general, they rely on a statement of intent on the part of the migrant. As intentions are not always fulfilled, it may result in discrepancies between recorded inflows and outflows for the country (Price, 1965).

In recent years significant efforts have been made in several countries in order to adjust their national statistics on international migration to correspond as close as possible to the 1976 United Nations recommendations (Kraly and Warren, 1992; Michalowski, 1991d).

In Consideration of a New Category of Immigrants

By nature of their status, Canadian citizens and permanent residents returning from abroad are people who are not required to seek admission. (Permanent residents who are away for more than 180 days require a returning resident permit.) They are free to reside in Canada for undetermined periods. Other movers, although they are only granted a temporary status, might remain in Canada for extended periods which can exceed one year. These non-immigrants, according to the Canadian concept, are non-permanent residents who have been traditionally excluded from any comprehensive demographic and socio-economic analysis of their impact on the country. It is easy to recognize, however, that they contribute to the economy as they can hold jobs and pay taxes. They are also consumers of goods and services, requiring housing, education and health care. Due to their distinct socio-demographic profile, they can also have a significant influence on Canadian society.

The purpose of this paper is to assess one of the two neglected migration streams — temporary movement of persons to Canada. Trends and selectivity among those migrants are analyzed. The study covers the period between 1981 and 1990, and is confined to the following characteristics: sex; age; marital status; occupation; place of destination in Canada; and place of origin. In order to elucidate some policy implications, the importance of this population is underlined in comparison with permanent residents (landed immigrants).

The non-permanent resident population encompasses documented visitors (persons with a visitor's visa), foreign workers in possession of employment authorization, foreign students authorized to attend educational institutions at any level, and holders of minister's permits authorizing them to reside in Canada on humanitarian, compassionate or national interest grounds. Refugee status claimants are included if at least one of the above documents was issued to them. The size and structure of this group is estimated using administrative data, specifically the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System. (For a detailed description of this system, see Michalowski, 1990). The estimates presented in this paper provide stock data which is the number of non-permanent residents at the mid-year point. They are compared with the respective year landings of immigrants (yearly flow of permanent residents). This comparison of the two different types of data seems to be the only logical approach in the case of comparing permanent and non-permanent residents, as:

- unlike its permanent counterpart, the non-permanent resident population experiences significant turnover (large number of entries into and departures from the population) during a one-year period; therefore, a direct comparison between these two streams of immigration on an annual basis is significantly biased;
- the same year departures from the permanent resident population (re-migration of landed immigrants) are expected to be relatively small; nevertheless, data on re-migration of permanent residents are not available;
- the analysis of monthly trends in the size of the non-permanent resident population indicates that the mid-year point estimate represents an average size of the population for a given year.

In these circumstances, the estimate of the non-permanent residents stock (as of June 1) can be considered as an approximation of the annual flow of permanent residents into Canada. The above approach enables a direct evaluation of the annual contribution made by non-permanent residents and immigrants to the labour force. It has to be realized, however, that unlike landed immigrants in the labour force who, with the exception of those re-migrating, have a cumulative impact, the non-permanent residents contribute only the number of person-years they are in the country and working.

TABLE 1. IMMIGRATION TO CANADA BY STATUS: 1981-1990 (IN THOUSANDS)

Status	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Permanent Residents										
Number	128.6	121.2	89.2	88.2	84.3	99.2	152.1	161.9	192.0	213.2 ¹
Change (%)	-	-5.8	-26.4	-1.1	-4.4	17.7	53.3	6.4	18.6	11.0
Non-Permanent Residents										
All ²										
Number	143.0	181.8	182.1	186.8	187.3	207.6	246.6	268.0	393.1	369.1
Change (%)	-	27.1	0.2	2.6	0.3	10.8	18.8	8.7	46.7	-6.1
Short-term ³										
Number	82.8	95.5	81.8	82.9	82.3	102.2	136.4	134.0	243.9	144.6
Change (%)	-	15.3	-14.3	1.3	-0.7	24.2	33.5	-1.7	82.0	-40.7
Long-Term ⁴										
Number	60.2	86.3	100.3	103.9	105.0	105.4	110.2	134.0	149.2	224.5
Change (%)	-	43.4	16.2	3.6	1.1	0.4	4.6	21.6	11.3	50.5
Total										
Number	271.6	303.0	271.3	275.0	271.6	306.8	398.7	429.9	585.1	577.0
Change (%)	-	11.6	-10.5	1.4	-1.2	13.0	30.0	7.8	36.1	-1.4
Ratio Between Non-Permanent and Permanent Residents (x 100)										
All	111	150	204	212	222	209	162	166	205	173
Long-term	47	71	112	118	125	106	72	83	78	105

¹Preliminary data.²Foreigners in Canada in possession of a document authorizing them to come and remain in Canada for a limited period of time.³Persons whose duration of stay in Canada was shorter than 1 year.⁴Persons whose duration of stay in Canada was 1 year or more.

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; Employment and Immigration Canada, Immigration Statistics, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

Canadian Immigration in the 1980s

The growth of the non-permanent resident population was generally positive for the 1981-1990 period (Table 1). The second half of this period experienced particularly dynamic growth. In 1990, there were about 370,000 non-permanent residents in Canada. The maximum in absolute and relative growth of this population occurred in 1989 (125,000 persons or 47%). This increase, exceptionally large for the considered period, can be explained by the fact that in 1989, exempted employment authorization was issued to almost 100,000 persons in Canada who claimed refugee status before that date and who were awaiting review of their claims.

Contemporaneously with the steady increase in the size of the non-permanent resident population, a tendency towards diversification in the flow of permanent residents appeared. At the beginning of the 1980s, the two populations were approximately the same size (140,000 non-permanent and 130,000 permanent residents). By 1983, however, the relative size of the non-permanent resident population increased to reach twice the size of its permanent counterpart. The size ratio of the two populations fluctuated around this level until decreasing in 1987. It still indicated, however, a prevalence of non-permanent residents in immigration to Canada. If non-permanent residents are regarded as an integral component of immigration to Canada, and the broadened concept of immigration is applied, one could point to the fact that in 1990 the actual level of immigration surpassed a half million persons. It has doubled over the period of the 1980s.

Enhancing the concept of immigration in Canada by considering all non-permanent residents, regardless of their length of stay in Canada, can be questioned in light of the United Nations recommendations and the nature of this movement. Results of recent studies of the degree of permanency of residence of this population reveal, however, that over the period of the 1980s, the non-permanent resident population has acquired a quasi-permanent character (Michalowski, 1991a). If a twelve-month criterion is recognized as appropriate to distinguish between short-term movers and long-term immigrants, then the first year after arrival is crucial. There is evidence that three-quarters of foreigners who, in 1981, were permitted into Canada for a limited period of time left before their one-year stay was over. Among those who arrived in Canada in 1989, only half left within the first year after arrival.

The above pattern seems to be reflected in the structure according to length of stay of the total non-permanent resident population of the 1980s (Table 1). At the beginning of this period, short-term, non-permanent residents

accounted for almost 60% of all non-permanent residents, but they were overtaken by long-term stayers by 1983. A steep increase in the number of short-term residents in 1989 resulted in the composition of this population being very similar to that from the beginning of the 1980s. In 1990, long-term residents had resumed their predominant position.

Nevertheless, following the United Nations definition of long-term immigrant, only those non-permanent residents to Canada whose duration of stay exceeds one year are considered in the analysis which follows. Consequently, it will be argued that in order to be coherent with the realities of the end of the 20th century, the Canadian concept of immigration must be redefined to accommodate the phenomenon of long-term, non-permanent inflow of foreigners. According to this redefined concept which is a close approximation of one of the recommended categories of immigrants (long-term immigrants), at the beginning of the 1980s, the Canadian level of immigration had already approached 200,000 persons. What seems to be of at least the same importance is the fact that Canadian immigration in the first half of the 1980s did not experience a downturn, but fluctuated around the stable level of 200,000. In 1990, immigration added almost 440,000 persons to the *de facto* Canadian population. In light of the above numbers only, it seems that any analysis of the impact of immigration on the economic and demographic situation of the 1980s in general, and specifically the situation at the beginning of the 1980s, could be misleading if focused exclusively on the permanent part of this movement.

In order to identify further possible shortcomings of studying immigration without taking its permanent and non-permanent components into account, a description of the structure of the non-permanent resident population is a prerequisite.

Demographics and Destination of Non-Permanent Residents

A very important feature of the non-permanent stream in Canadian immigration is its heterogeneity. As it is composed of persons holding four different types of documents issued on diversified grounds to persons with distinct personal characteristics, the dynamics of these four categories of non-permanent residents are prime factors behind the changing size, and demographic and socio-economic structure of the long-term, non-permanent resident population. In 1981, employment authorization and student visa holders were the two largest subcategories of long-term non-permanent residents, with workers slightly out-numbering students (Table 2). Persons in possession of minister's permits were not far behind, occupying third place.

TABLE 2. LONG-TERM NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS BY CATEGORY: CANADA, 1981-1990 (IN THOUSANDS)

Category	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Visitors	8.3	10.4	10.9	10.5	10.3	10.2	10.2	10.6	12.8	14.5
Change (%)	-	25.3	4.8	-3.7	-1.9	-1.0	0.0	3.9	20.8	13.3
Workers	26.3	38.2	47.5	53.8	59.6	63.8	70.4	91.4	95.2	162.9
Change (%)	-	45.2	24.3	13.3	10.8	7.0	10.3	29.8	4.2	71.1
Students	23.9	37.0	43.8	43.5	39.4	35.7	34.3	36.7	41.7	40.2
Change (%)	-	54.8	18.4	-0.7	-9.4	-9.4	-3.9	7.0	13.6	-3.6
Minister's Permit Holders	20.3	25.7	28.1	27.5	27.0	25.0	21.9	29.9	28.2	22.1
Change (%)	-	26.6	9.3	-2.1	-1.8	-7.4	-12.4	36.5	-5.7	-21.6
Total ¹	78.8	111.3	130.3	135.3	136.3	134.7	136.8	168.6	177.9	239.7
Change (%)	-	41.2	17.1	3.8	0.7	-1.2	1.6	23.2	5.5	34.7

¹This represents sum of the independent estimates for each category. As a foreigner in Canada can hold more than one document, this total is greater than the number of all long-term, non-permanent residents in Table 1.

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System.

TABLE 3. PERMANENT AND NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS¹ BY SEX AND AGE GROUP: CANADA, 1990² (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

Age Group	Permanent Residents			Non-Permanent Residents			Ratio Between Non-Permanent and Permanent Residents (x 100)
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	
0-4	5.6	5.7	5.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	3
5-9	8.0	8.1	7.8	1.2	1.0	1.3	15
10-14	7.7	7.8	7.5	1.2	1.0	1.3	16
15-19	6.8	7.0	6.6	4.6	4.3	5.0	70
20-24	10.1	9.8	10.4	19.2	18.3	20.5	196
25-29	15.5	16.0	15.0	26.2	26.6	25.7	175
30-34	14.0	14.3	13.7	20.5	21.5	19.4	152
35-39	10.2	10.3	10.1	11.9	12.6	11.0	120
40-44	6.7	6.9	6.5	6.5	6.8	6.0	100
45-49	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.2	100
50-54	2.7	2.4	3.0	1.9	1.8	1.9	72
55-59	2.5	2.2	2.9	1.2	1.0	1.4	48
60-64	2.6	2.3	2.9	0.8	0.6	1.0	31
65+	4.1	3.6	4.8	1.2	0.8	2.1	33
Total							
Number (in thousands)	213.2	107.7	105.4	224.5	128.8	95.7	105
Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-

¹ Long-term non-permanent residents only
² Preliminary data

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

The visitor population was the smallest, equal to one-third of the worker population. Although the order of relative importance did not change during the 1980s, there were significant changes to category size. These changes can be summarized as follows:

- a sextupling in the size of the worker category;
- a significant increase in both the student and the documented visitor populations (68% and 75%, respectively);
- a slight increase in the size of the minister's permit holder population (9%).

As a result, in 1990, there were more than four times as many workers as students, almost eight times more workers than minister's permit holders, and eleven times more workers than documented visitors.

Aside from an obvious influence on the economic situation, a predominance of workers among non-permanent residents in the 1980s, and specifically at the end of this period, bears important consequences for Canadian society from the demographic point of view.

It is well-known that, unlike in the total Canadian population where there is an excess of females, the immigrant population is composed of more men than women. In 1990, the sex ratio for permanent residents was equal to 102 males per 100 females (Table 3). The non-permanent resident population also consisted of more men than women, but the sex ratio was highly unbalanced (135 males per 100 females). Altogether, it seems that immigration contributed more to levelling the quantitative difference between men and women in Canada than to maintaining the status quo.

The age structure of the non-permanent resident population can be used as further evidence supporting the significance of considering this migratory movement. It is similar to the age distribution of the permanent resident population, with the highest proportion of persons in the 25-29 year age group (Table 3). What distinguishes the age structures of the two streams of immigration is the larger concentration of non-permanent residents than permanent residents in the 20-35 year age interval. In 1990, two-thirds of non-permanent residents belonged to this age interval — twice the proportion characteristic of permanent residents. Therefore, by neglecting long-term, non-permanent residents, the impact of immigration on this group, which is considered to contribute the most to the natural increase of population through births, is underestimated. Furthermore, an

underestimation of the economic gains from immigration can be important, as non-permanent residents increase by two to three times the number of immigrants in the prime production ages (between 20 years and 50 years). On the other hand, their contribution to the age groups under 15 years and over 65 years is relatively small. Thus, a consideration of non-permanent residents as a component of the immigrant population results in depreciation of the dependency ratio for this population.

The structure according to marital status is the other demographic characteristic which indicates the importance of non-permanent residents for the analysis of the impact of immigration on the receiving society (Table 4). Their addition further reinforces a disproportion between the share of single persons in the immigrant population and the total Canadian population, with all foreseen consequences resulting from this disproportion.

Finally, it seems that the predominant position of workers in the non-permanent resident population determines, to a great extent, the geographic distribution of this population in Canada (Tables 5 and 6). As in the case of permanent residents, an overwhelming majority of non-permanent residents have chosen Ontario and Quebec as their place of intended destination. Eighty percent of non-permanent residents lived in these two provinces, compared to 72% for permanent residents. Ontario alone attracted 60% of non-permanent residents. After Ontario and Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta ranked third and fourth most important provinces of residence, with proportions of non-permanent residents equalling 9 and 5%, respectively.

Interestingly, a comparison of the structure of non-permanent and permanent resident populations would indicate the greater importance of the former for the Maritime provinces, Quebec and Ontario, as opposed to the Western provinces. In 1990, at the Canada level, non-permanent residents would be twofold the size of immigration. They would, however, increase by four times the permanent resident population in Newfoundland, and significantly more than two times those of Nova Scotia, Northwest Territories, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. The below average influence of this stream of immigration on the rest of the provinces is especially evident in the case of Yukon and Manitoba. British Columbia and Alberta occupy just eighth and ninth places in the hierarchy of the relative attractiveness as a destination for non-permanent versus permanent residents.

**TABLE 4. PERMANENT AND NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS¹ BY SEX AND MARITAL STATUS: CANADA, 1990²
(PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)**

Marital Status	Permanent Residents				Non-Permanent Residents			Ratio Between Non-Permanent and Permanent Residents (x 100)
	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females		
Single	52.1	55.9	48.2	56.0	54.8	57.6	112	
Married	43.9	42.5	45.3	40.9	43.6	37.4	97	
Widowed	2.9	0.8	5.1	1.7	0.4	3.2	59	
Divorced	1.1	0.8	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.8	131	
Total	213.2	107.7	105.4	224.5	128.8	95.7	105	
Number (in thousands)								
Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	

¹ Long-term non-permanent residents only

² Preliminary data

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

TABLE 5. PERMANENT AND NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS¹ BY PROVINCE AND TERRITORY OF INTENDED DESTINATION: CANADA, 1982, 1986, 1990 (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

Province and Territory	1982				1986				1990				Ratio Between Non-Permanent and Permanent Residents (x 100)	
	Permanent		Non-Permanent		Permanent		Non-Permanent		Permanent		Non-Permanent		1982	
	0.3	0.9	0.3	1.5	0.3	1.5	0.3	1.0	0.3	1.0	0.3	1.0	1986	1990
Newfoundland	0.3	0.9	0.3	1.5	0.3	1.5	0.3	1.0	0.3	1.0	0.3	1.0	563	396
Prince Edward Island	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	23	35
Nova Scotia	1.0	1.9	1.1	1.8	1.1	1.8	0.7	1.1	0.7	1.1	1.28	1.1	177	155
New Brunswick	0.6	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	114	132	132	120
Quebec	17.6	18.9	19.6	19.9	19.0	21.3	77	107	116	116	116	116	116	116
Ontario	43.8	55.8	53.1	59.2	91	114	116	116	116	116	116	116	116	116
Manitoba	4.1	3.0	3.8	3.2	3.1	1.6	91	54	91	54	91	54	91	54
Saskatchewan	1.8	1.2	1.9	1.7	1.1	1.0	93	95	93	95	93	95	93	95
Alberta	14.8	7.2	9.7	7.7	8.8	5.2	83	62	83	62	83	62	83	62
British Columbia	15.7	9.9	12.7	9.6	13.4	9.0	81	70	81	70	81	70	81	70
Yukon	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67	28	67	28	67	28	67	28
Northwest Territories Canada	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	30	132	30	132	30	132	30	132
Number (in thousands)	121.2	86.3	99.2	105.4	213.2	224.5	106	105	106	105	106	105	106	105
Percentage	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Long-term non-permanent residents only

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; Employment and Immigration Canada, "Immigration Statistics 1986", Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

TABLE 6. PERMANENT AND NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS¹ BY SELECTED CENSUS METROPOLITAN AREA OF INTENDED DESTINATION: CANADA, 1990² (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

Census Metropolitan Area	Permanent Residents		Non-Permanent Residents	
	Number ³	%	Number ³	%
Calgary	8.2	3.9	3.7	1.7
Edmonton	8.2	3.8	3.9	1.7
Halifax	1.2	0.5	1.4	0.6
Montreal	36.2	17.0	43.5	19.4
Ottawa-Hull	7.7	3.6	11.3	5.0
Regina	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.3
Toronto	72.8	34.2	96.5	43.0
Vancouver	20.2	9.5	15.0	6.7
Winnipeg	6.1	2.8	2.6	1.2
Other	51.5	24.2	31.6	14.1
Not classified	-	-	14.3	6.3
Total	213.2	100.0	224.5	100.0

¹ Long-term non-permanent residents only

² Preliminary data

³ In thousands

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

TABLE 7. WORKERS AMONG PERMANENT AND NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS¹: CANADA, 1981-1990

Status of Workers	1981		1982		1983		1984		1985	
	Number ²	%	Number ²	%	Number ²	%	Number ²	%	Number ²	%
Permanent	57.0	68.4	55.5	59.2	37.1	43.9	38.5	41.7	38.5	39.2
Non-Permanent	26.3	31.6	38.2	40.8	47.5	56.1	53.8	58.3	59.6	60.8
Total	83.3	100.0	93.7	100.0	84.6	100.0	92.3	100.0	98.1	100.0
Proportion (%) of Workers Among										
Permanent Residents		44.3		45.8		41.6		43.7		45.7
Non-permanent Residents ¹		43.7		44.3		47.4		51.8		56.8
<hr/>										
Status of Workers	1986		1987		1988		1989		1990 ³	
	Number ²	%	Number ²	%	Number ²	%	Number ²	%	Number ²	%
Permanent	48.2	43.0	76.7	52.1	76.3	45.5	98.2	50.8	114.1	41.2
Non-Permanent	63.8	57.0	70.4	47.9	91.4	54.5	95.2	49.2	162.9	58.8
Total	112.0	100.0	147.1	100.0	167.7	100.0	193.4	100.0	277.0	100.0
Proportion (%) of Workers Among										
Permanent Residents		48.6		50.4		47.1		51.1		53.5
Non-permanent Residents ¹		60.5		63.9		68.2		63.8		72.6

¹Long-term non-permanent residents only²In thousands

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; Employment and Immigration Canada, Immigration Statistics, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

The above conclusions are confirmed by the analysis of non-permanent residents' intended destination according to Census Metropolitan Area (Table 6). Toronto is the most important drawing urban area, as it is the place of destination for 43% of non-permanent residents. Together with Ottawa-Hull, it attracts over 80% of all Ontario non-permanent residents. In comparison, the proportion for permanent residents is 70%. In general, it seems that the non-permanent resident population is even more concentrated in the large urban areas than is its permanent counterpart.

The above brief demographic profile of non-permanent residents, with the underlined similarities and dissimilarities in relation to permanent residents, would indicate the economic importance of this population in Canada. In order to assess this importance, the composition of the foreign-born worker population with non-permanent status will be examined.

Economic Context of Broadening the Immigration Concept

Persons designated for the labour force have always occupied an important place in immigration to Canada. Over the period of the 1980s, their importance was growing as the proportion of workers among permanent residents increased by 10% (from 44% in 1981 to 54% in 1990) (Table 7). A similar analysis of the participation rate characteristic for non-permanent residents indicates an even greater significance of workers in this population. At the beginning of the 1980s, workers were in the minority, and as in the case of permanent residents, they accounted for 44% of all non-permanent residents. By the middle of the period, however, their proportion exceeded 50%, and in 1990, almost three-quarters of non-permanent residents in Canada were authorized to hold a job. Changes in the structure of the immigrant worker population in terms of their status reflected trends in the observed participation rates (Table 7). With the exception of the first year of the 1980s, immigrant workers with non-permanent status dominated the immigrant worker population. Their significance was highest in the period when the levels of the permanent component of Canadian immigration were decreasing (between 1983 and 1986). In fact, the presence of non-permanent workers assured a continuation of the positive contribution of 1980s immigration to the Canadian economy.

This important conclusion should be viewed in the context of structural changes among workers with non-permanent status. It must be noted that unlike permanent migration policies (which have a long history), a legislative frame for the immigration of workers to Canada on a temporary basis was established in 1973 with the introduction of the Employment

Authorization Programme. And like the labour recruitment programmes of other countries, its purpose was to react to specific demands of the Canadian labour market. The development of the programme however, seems to have shifted its focus to one of providing work opportunity, and thus self-sustenance, for persons already in Canada (Boyd and Taylor, 1986; Michalowski, 1991b). Two types of employment authorization are allowed under the programme: validated permits to ensure that the employment and career opportunities of permanent residents and Canadian citizens are not affected; and exempted from the labour market, validation procedures permits. Due to restrictions for all employment in occupations which experienced massive lay-offs of Canadian workers, a downturn in the validated authorization category appeared in 1982 (Boyd, Taylor and Delaney, 1986). By 1985, over half of workers with non-permanent status had an exempted authorization. This proportion was still growing after 1985 as Canada, in compliance with the 1985 Supreme Court ruling known as the "Singh Decision", issued neither employer nor job-oriented employment authorization to "in Canada exempted groups" such as refugee status claimants, applicants for landing, and persons under enforcement.

The above structural changes to the non-permanent worker population resulted in their specific occupational composition (Table 8). The large proportion of workers in non-classified occupations is striking (82% for men and 75% for women, respectively). They are three times as numerous as among their permanent counterparts. This situation was caused by the dominant position of workers — refugee status claimants. Their exempted employment authorization was the so-called "open occupation". This automatically means that information on the occupation of the holders of this authorization is not available, and any appraisal of their skills is impossible. It also indicates that the non-permanent worker population consisted of a large proportion of those who were not pre-selected on the basis of labour market considerations.

A comparison of the occupational structure of non-permanent and permanent residents reveals significant differences. Among the latter group, almost 10% of workers hold jobs related to fabricating, assembling and repairing, and those in clerical occupations are not far behind (8%). The other occupations among permanent workers are in services (7%); natural sciences, engineering and mathematics (6%); and managerial and administrative positions (6%). On the part of non-permanent workers, service occupations prevail in general (7%), and especially among women (16%). The other important occupational groups, in decreasing order, are teaching (3%); managerial and administrative (3%); entrepreneurs and investors (2%); and natural sciences, engineering and mathematics (2%). Obviously, these

results have to be viewed in the context of the differentiated level of non-classified occupations for both populations of workers.

TABLE 8. WORKERS AMONG PERMANENT AND NON-PERMANENT RESIDENTS¹ BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP: CANADA, 1990* (PERCENT DISTRIBUTION)

Occupational Group	Status of Workers				Ratio Between Non-permanent and Permanent Workers (X 100)
	Permanent	Non-Permanent			
		Total	Males	Females	
Entrepreneurs and Investors	3.5	1.7	1.6	1.8	67
Managerial and Administrative	6.2	2.7	4.0	0.8	60
Natural Sciences, Engineering and Mathematics	6.3	1.5	2.1	0.6	32
Social Sciences	1.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	31
Religion	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.3	190
Teaching	2.3	3.3	4.1	2.0	198
Medicine and Health	3.5	0.8	0.7	0.9	32
Artistic, Literary, Performing Arts	1.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	24
Sports and Recreation	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	134
Clerical	8.1	0.8	0.4	1.5	14
Sales	3.8	0.4	0.3	0.4	14
Services	6.8	7.4	1.7	15.9	152
Farming, Horticultural and Animal Husbandry	2.0	0.2	0.3	0.1	13
Fishing, Hunting, Trapping	0.1	0.0	0.0	-	8
Forestry and Logging	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52
Mining and Quarrying	0.1	0.0	0.0	-	15
Processing	1.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	20
Machining	2.3	0.1	0.2	0.0	13
Fabricating, Assembling and Repairing	9.3	0.5	0.7	0.3	8
Construction	5.0	0.3	0.5	0.0	9
Transport Equipment Operating	1.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	7
Material Handling	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	22
Other Crafts and Equipment Operating	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	9
Not Classified	34.5	78.9	81.8	74.6	321
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	143

¹Long-term non-permanent residents only

²Preliminary data

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

When considering only workers for which occupation is known, it seems that, relative to permanent workers, workers with non-permanent status in Canada contribute the most to teaching and to services (four times and three times more than their permanent counterparts, respectively). It can also be observed that non-permanent workers more likely than permanent workers hold occupations from the top of the occupational hierarchy. In general, neglecting non-permanent workers as a component of immigration to

Canada depreciates the real levels of addition of participants to the Canadian labour market by one-and-a-half times.

Finally, the economic importance of all non-permanent residents, not just non-permanent workers, must be recognized. Persons admitted temporarily for purposes of study or for humanitarian reasons can also make a valuable contribution to the economy. This "hidden" aspect of the non-permanent stream in migration should not be forgotten when the economic impact of this stream is assessed.

Some Social Considerations of the Redefined Concept of Immigration

A hypothesis that demographic characteristics of non-permanent residents are to a great extent defined by their origins was confirmed in the case of one of the categories in this movement — non-permanent workers in Canada (Michalowski, 1991b). As this category represents the majority of non-permanent residents, the existence of this relation can be generalized to the total non-permanent resident population. Nevertheless, a consideration of the origins of the migratory movement has another very important aspect. Immigrant origins are an indication of their cultural and ethnic background, and their characteristics should be an immanent part of any analysis of the social impact of immigration.

When all categories of long-term, non-permanent residents are considered together, it is evident that, in the 1980s, the absolute size of this population for every continent of origin was increasing. This common tendency has most significantly influenced persons from Central America — their number has increased sixteenfold. The second and third most dynamically growing groups were persons from Oceania and other Ocean Islands and Africans, with their numbers increasing by over 7 and 3 1/2 times, respectively. On the other end of the scale defined by the growth rates were North Americans (persons coming from the United States and Mexico) and Caribbeans. Non-permanent residents originating in these two geographical regions in closest proximity to Canada experienced just 50% increases in their relative size.

The observed steady increase in the size of the non-permanent resident groups, irrespective of their provenance, is the one distinctive feature of this stream of immigration which may have social consequences for Canada. On the other hand, the composition of this population according to origin displayed a very interesting pattern, one which is different from that for the permanent resident population (Table 9). The most important differences can be confined to the following observations:

Table 9. Permanent and Non-Permanent Residents¹ by Continent of Last Permanent Residence: Canada, 1982, 1986, 1990 (percent distribution)

Continent	1982		1986		1990 ²	
	Permanent Residents	Non-Permanent Residents	Permanent Residents	Non-Permanent Residents	Permanent Residents	Non-Permanent Residents
Europe	38.2	16.1	22.9	14.5	24.2	15.2
Africa	3.7	5.8	4.8	6.9	6.3	8.5
Asia	34.4	41.6	41.9	42.3	52.1	44.0
Australasia	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.9	0.4	0.7
North America	8.2	10.6	7.9	9.4	3.4	6.0
Central America	0.9	1.4	5.5	2.4	3.1	9.0
Caribbean	7.2	15.2	8.9	13.5	5.5	9.2
South America	5.7	8.0	6.8	9.7	4.2	6.2
Oceania and other						
Ocean Islands	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹Long-term non-permanent residents only.

²Preliminary data.

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; Employment and Immigration Canada, *Immigration Statistics 1986*, Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

- a significantly smaller proportion of Europeans among non-permanent than among permanent residents displayed stability over the 1980s, while a steep decrease for the latter appeared (14%age points);
- the Asian continent contribution to the non-permanent resident population resulted in very moderate growth of its share, but it had a very significant effect on the share for the permanent resident population (an increase of 18%age points);
- the Central American region exercised a constant influence on the permanent resident population over time, while this region was a major factor behind the compositional changes in the non-permanent resident population.

The shifts in the origin of non-permanent residents resulted in greater diversity in this population than among the permanent resident population (Table 10). In 1990, 57% of non-permanent residents came from the top 15 countries of last permanent residence. This proportion for permanent residents was equal to 64%. Moreover, the same 13 countries composed the list of the top 15 countries for both populations. Only Jamaica and Taiwan on the permanent residents list were replaced by Trinidad and Tobago, and Ghana on the list for non-permanent residents. The ranking of the countries, however, was different. In consequence, the only four non-Third World countries from the list (Poland, Great Britain, the United States, and Portugal) together sent 17% of permanent residents, but only 12% non-permanent residents. In general, it seems that countries which have experienced political unrest (Philippines, China, Sri Lanka, El Salvador) are more important sources of non-permanent than of permanent residents in Canada.

The results of analysis of origins of non-permanent and permanent residents give further evidence to the recognition that international migration, and particularly non-permanent migration, is a response to global inequality. Regional imbalances in the rates of population and economic growth imply an unmanageable reduction of subsistence for certain countries. This creates specific geographically oriented immigration streams, and puts an even greater pressure upon countries recognized as immigration receivers. The international political situation is another factor behind an increasing pressure to receive immigrants experienced by such countries as Canada. These pressures seem to be a driving force behind non-permanent immigration to Canada.

Redefining the Concept of Immigration in Canada

Table 10. Top 15 Countries of Last Permanent Residence for Permanent and Non-Permanent Residents¹: Canada, 1990²

Permanent Residents			Non-Permanent Residents		
Country	Number ('000)	%	Country	Number ('000)	%
1. Hong Kong	28.9	13.6	1. Philippines	14.5	6.5
2. Poland	16.5	7.8	2. Hong Kong	13.8	6.2
3. Lebanon	12.4	5.8	3. China	12.1	5.4
4. Philippines	12.0	5.6	4. Sri Lanka	11.8	5.3
5. India	10.6	5.0	5. U.S.A.	11.1	4.9
6. Vietnam Soc.Rep.	9.1	4.3	6. Trinidad & Tobago	9.6	4.3
7. Great Britain	8.0	3.8	7. El Salvador	8.9	4.0
8. China	7.9	3.7	8. Iran	8.7	3.9
9. U.S.A.	6.0	2.8	9. India	6.3	2.8
10. Portugal	5.6	2.6	10. Great Britain	5.9	2.7
11. Jamaica	4.9	2.3	11. Ghana	5.3	2.3
12. El Salvador	4.3	2.0	12. Poland	5.1	2.3
13. Taiwan	3.6	1.7	13. Lebanon	4.9	2.2
14. Iran	3.5	1.6	14. Japan	4.6	2.1
15. Sri Lanka	3.1	1.5	15. Portugal	4.5	2.0
Total of Top 15 Countries	136.5	64.0	Total of Top 15 Countries	127.3	56.7
Other	76.7	36.0	Other	97.2	43.3
Total	213.2	100.0	Total	224.5	100.0

¹Long-term non-permanent residents only

²Preliminary data

Source: Demography Division, Statistics Canada estimates based on the Employment and Immigration Canada Visitors Immigration Data System; and unpublished data provided by Employment and Immigration Canada.

There is every indication that these pressures will continue in the future. Thus, neglecting the non-permanent movement might have profound consequences for any assessment of the Canadian social make-up and resultant social policies. For example, it is well-known that recent permanent immigration has contributed to significant shifts in the ethnic composition of the Canadian population (Hali, et al., 1990; White, 1990). Judging from the origins of non-permanent residents, these compositional changes are, *de facto*, even more dramatic.

A multicultural and multiracial country like Canada cannot ignore, in developing its policies toward improving the situation of its residents who are visually identifiable and different from the majority of the population, over 200,000 persons who do not have permanent resident status but whose tenure has, in fact, a quasi-permanent character. It is estimated that three-quarters of them should be considered as visible minorities (Michalowski,

1991c). To illustrate the relative importance of visible minorities among non-permanent residents, one can point to the fact that according to the 1986 Census of Canada, over-one-and-a-half million persons should be considered to belong to visible minorities in Canada (Boxhill, 1990).

Concluding Remarks

Recognition of the existence of non-permanent residents as an important part of the Canadian *de facto* population seems to be the only logical approach in dealing with the Canadian reality. Interest in this recognition has been manifested throughout the 1980s by governments at different levels, academia and the private sector. Aside from reasons of international comparability, the size, quasi-permanent character and distinct structure of the resident population with temporary status in Canada justify an inclusion of this population in the major statistical systems such as census and immigration statistics. Other Canadian data sources such as vital statistics and Revenue Canada data systems already encompass this component of the Canadian population. This action would result in data which will not be at variance with the demands being placed upon services for education, medical care and social assistance. Furthermore, it would allow unbiased analysis of demographic, social and economic trends in Canada, which might result in the development of more comprehensive policies.

This paper has attempted to demonstrate the importance of the non-permanent resident population in Canada from the immigration point of view. Conceptualization of immigration as "just the movement of persons into the country to establish relatively long-term residence" would accommodate factors, ignored so far, which may provide long-term benefits for Canada. Non-permanent residents who go back to their countries of origin will often eventually return to Canada, thereby intensifying particular directions of inflows and reinforcing migratory networks. Some non-permanent residents (for example, most of the refugee status claimants) are transient movers, in the sense that their temporary status is an intermediate stage on their way to becoming permanent residents in Canada. There is no reason why they should be included as a part of the population in Canada only at the moment of granting permanent status.

Redefinition of the concept of immigration, followed by enhancement of immigration statistics, will finally make possible the reconciliation of scientific analysis with the reality it purports to reflect.

Disclaimer

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Population Society, Queen's University, Kingston, 2-4 June, 1991. Views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of Statistics Canada.

References

- Beaujot, R. 1989. *Immigration and the Population of Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Employment and Immigration Canada.
- Beaujot, R., Rappak, P. 1989. The link between immigration and emigration in Canada, 1945-1986. *Canadian Studies in Population*, 16(20): 201-216.
- Boxhill, W. 1990. *Making the Tough Choices in Using Census Data to Count Visible Minorities in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Boyd, M., Taylor, C. 1986. The feminization of temporary workers: the Canadian case. *International Migration*, 24(4):717-734.
- Boyd, M., Taylor, C., Delaney, P. 1986. Temporary workers in Canada: a multifaceted program. *International Migration Review*, 20(4):929-950.
- De Vortez, D.J. 1989. *Immigration and Employment Effects*. Ottawa, ON: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Employment and Immigration Canada. 1990. *Annual Report to Parliament. Immigration Plan for 1991-1995*. Ottawa, ON: Supply and Services Canada.
- Fortier, C. 1989. Estimation of the number of Canadians returning to Canada after an absence of more than one year. Paper presented at the 57th Conference of L'ACFAS, Montreal, PQ, May 1989.
- Government of Canada. 1985. *Immigration Act 1976-77. c. 52, s.1*. Ottawa, ON: Queen's Printer for Canada.
- Halli, S., et al. (eds.). 1990. *Ethnic Demography. Canadian Immigrant, Racial and Cultural Variations*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Hawkins, F. 1989. *Critical Years in Immigration: Canada and Australia Compared*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill - Queen's University Press.
- Kerr, K. 1986. *Immigration and the Canadian labour market. Background paper prepared for the Research Branch, Library of Parliament*. Ottawa, ON.
- Kraly, E.P., Warren, R. 1992. Estimates of long-term immigration to the United States: Moving U.S. statistics toward United Nations concepts. *Demography*, 29(4): 613-626.
- Michalowski, M. 1991a. Foreign temporary residents to Canada: short-term movers or long-term immigrants? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Washington, DC, March 21-23, 1991.

- Michalowski, M. 1991b. The dynamics of recent south-north flows of temporary workers: a Canadian case study. Paper prepared for a presentation at the IUSSP Conference on The Peopling of the Americas, Veracruz, May 18-23, 1992.
- Michalowski, M. 1991c. Visible minorities among the extended census target population: estimate as of August 1, 1990. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada (unpublished).
- Michalowski, M. 1991d. Incorporation of non-permanent residents and Canadian returnees in the population estimation programme. Paper presented at the meeting of the Federal-Provincial Committee on Demography, Ottawa, ON: May 30, 1991.
- Michalowski, M. 1990. Temporary immigrants to Canada: numbers and characteristics in the 1980s. Paper presented at the 1990 North American Conference on Applied Demography, Bowling Green, Ohio, October 18-21, 1990.
- Nash, A. 1987. The Economic Impact of the Entrepreneur. Immigrant Program". Ottawa, ON: Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Price, C.A. 1965. Some problems of international migration statistics: An Australian case-study. *Population Studies*, 19(1):17-27.
- Richmond, A.H., Kalbach, W.E. 1980. Factors in the Adjustment of Immigrants and Their Descendants. Ottawa, ON: Supply and Services, Canada.
- Samuel, J.T. 1988. Immigration and visible minorities. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 20(2).
- Samuel, J.T., Jansson, M. 1988. Canada's Immigration Levels and the Economic and Demographic Environment, 1967-1987". Ottawa, ON: Employment and Immigration Canada.
- Simmons, A. 1987. The United Nations recommendations and data efforts: International migration statistics. *International Migrations Review*, 21(4): 996-1016.
- United Nations. 1980. Recommendations on statistics of international migration. *Statistical Papers*, Series M, No. 58. New York, NY: United Nations.
- United Nations. 1953. International migration statistics. *Statistical Papers*, Series M, No. 20. New York, NY: United Nations.
- White, P. 1990. Ethnic Diversity in Canada. 1986 Census of Canada. Ottawa, ON: Supply and Services, Canada.

Received, July, 1991; revised, April, 1993.