

DRAFT/September 1970

MIGRANT HEALTH PROGRAM STATISTICS

Population Data - Discussion of Sources

BACKGROUND

Anyone who becomes involved in migrant research or service programs soon becomes confused at the variety of national migrant population estimates. Even at the State and local levels, estimates vary for the same geographic area. To a large extent, each service agency uses its own definition of migrant, sometimes specified in law, and develops its own population data for its own program purposes.

Besides the problem of differing program definitions, there are the problems of counting a population of only one million--or possibly less--that is constantly on the move as a condition of their way of earning a living. This is like looking for a needle in a haystack--with the area of the haystack nearly as large as the area of the United States.

Migrants live for brief periods each year in 900 counties scattered over most of the 48 States. Most of these counties comprise work areas where the people perform labor essential to the local agricultural economy. A few of the counties, chiefly in the South, are the places to which the people return when work is not available elsewhere.

As the people return to their point of origin, they move into neighborhoods and sometimes even into the homes of others like themselves, a submerged,

Prepared by Helen Johnston, Rural Health Consultant, Community Health Service, September 1970.

poverty-stricken group without opportunity and with little hope. In these "home" areas migrants may be more difficult to count than elsewhere since they are often so indistinguishable from others in the community. Moreover, past experience is no guide to the future since the decision to move may be made very quickly early in the spring, and the person who decides to move this year may be different from the person who moved last year.

Technology, which sometimes results in rapid shifts in farm labor demand in particular local areas, has led to an over-all national decline in the hired farm work force, including migrants, during the last half century. Until about the mid-1950's, the decline in the number of hired farm workers paralleled the decline in the number of farm operators and family members working on farms. Since then, the hired farm work force has declined at a slower rate than the members of families of farm operators.

It should be stressed that work opportunity has declined at a faster rate than the number of workers available for jobs. Increasingly, unemployment and underemployment plague those still firmly attached to the farm work force.

It should also be noted that the farm labor supply is not related solely to farm labor demand. In addition it is related to the "state of health" of the rest of the economy, and to the availability of other work alternatives for displaced farm workers. It decreases during times of general prosperity and increases under depression conditions. At present, however, dwindling work opportunities for workers skilled only in agriculture, accentuate the problems of migrants and other farm workers who find themselves increasingly with no place to go.

"There is a quiet crisis smoldering in rural America," according to a leading farm economist. "Changes in the economic, political and social organization in rural areas have resulted in low returns for resources and low levels of living. Many migratory farm workers, farm operators, and rural non-farm residents are a part of the rural poor, the silent minority in our society that are, in truth, the people left behind."

Current estimates of the size of the migrant segment of the total needy rural population range from about one-half to one million. The estimates equal or exceed the population of any one of 14 States in the mid-1960's. If this population was in one place year round, it would have a complex network of resources and services to support it.

National migrant population estimates, of course, even if they were completely accurate and comprehensive--covering both workers and the dependents of workers--would be only a partial measure of the extent of the migrant problem and of the resources required to meet it. People who move routinely must have housing, education, health, day care, recreation and other resources for wholesome, healthful and safe individual or family living at each location where they live temporarily. If they move at least two or three times during each calendar year, the total investment in the facilities required to meet their needs is two or three times that required for the same number of people remaining in one place year round.

The rest of this paper reviews continuing data series and recent efforts to develop national, State or local migrant/population estimates. The
and other seasonal farmworker

paper describes the general method and approach of each, and some of its limitations. Excluded from consideration, however, are foreign workers imported for temporary work in agriculture in the United States under formal legal, recruitment programs.

SOURCES OF MIGRANT STATISTICS

Bureau of the Census

The national census counts as migrants persons who move from one place to another during a year to change their permanent residence. Such movers number in the millions. By definition, many seasonal agricultural migrants are excluded from the census count since their moves are not for a permanent change of residence, but rather for seasonal job-seeking, with a return to their place of origin when jobs are no longer available elsewhere.

In spite of the intent of migrants to return, Census data show greater mobility generally among hired farm workers (persons past their 14th birthday) than among other occupational groups. About one-fourth of the hired farm work force changes their permanent place of residence in a given year, compared with one-fifth of all employed workers.

Prior to the 1960 decennial census, the Census Bureau was approached by an interagency committee, including the Public Health Service, concerned with the problems of agricultural migrants. The response to the committee's request for assistance was that the "Census of Population is a completely unsuitable means of securing information desired about migratory agricultural workers." The reasons were the costliness of a question regarding such a small number of persons, and the probable unreliability of any information that might be obtained.

Neither was the Census of Agriculture considered a suitable mechanism for getting information since a large "number of respondents (would) be asked questions on which only a relatively small proportion could provide information." Moreover, much of the farm work done is on contract between the individual farmer and a buyer, food processor, or other agent who procures the required labor. Detailed information about workers would not be available on the basis of the individual farm establishment.

At the same time that the Census Bureau made this response, it also offered to work with interested groups in designing and conducting a special survey, provided financing could be found. There was no follow-up to take advantage of this offer.

U. S. Department of Agriculture

For the last 20 years the U. S. Department of Agriculture has used the machinery of the Current Population Survey of the Bureau of the Census to obtain national estimates of the number of workers in the hired farm labor force. (Attached is a copy of the latest annual report of the Department's Economic Research Service.) The data are based on additional questions included in the December CPS survey. (See attached survey forms.) These questions are designed to obtain information from respondent households about participation by members of the household over 14 years of age in the hired farm work force. If any person 14 years old or over in the household did any farm work for cash wages or salary--even for one day--during the past year, further questions are asked to determine the degree of attachment to the hired farm work force, age, sex, migratory

status, and other information. The data requested by the USDA vary from time to time. The Migrant Health Program has had an opportunity periodically to review the USDA's special questionnaire and suggest modifications.

Since the total sample is small, (50,000 occupied households) data are reported only by broad Regions--Northeast, North Central, South and West. State and local data are not available. In December 1968, only 1,800 farm wage workers were found in the families interviewed. Of these, 234 were migrants. Information is not routinely obtained on family members other than workers.

The USDA's method, using the CPS monthly survey mechanism, has the advantage that the worker himself is questioned. Reliance is not placed on estimates made by someone else about workers. It also has the advantage of covering the work history for the past year, and of being done nationwide at one time, thus eliminating possible duplication of count. However, it has several disadvantages including such obvious ones as those of cross-cultural communication between professional interviewers and farmworker households, problems of recall of work for a 12-month period involving as it may several employers in different localities, and the distrust of officialdom commonly found among migrants.

Some of the limitations of the data are explained in the appendix to the USDA's report. The national CPS sample is selected to be representative of the entire Nation in order to provide labor force and other national data in inter-censal years. The monthly sample of

of braceros has been replaced by an increase in the river of people flowing across the Border both under and outside the Immigration Act.* A statistical sampling approach to obtaining data on migrant farm workers during the off-season that is confined solely to counties of the United States is less than adequate since many Mexican-Americans return to Mexico in the winter.

There is also the continuing problem already referred to that the CPS sample is drawn to be representative of the total U. S. population. As previously mentioned, a sample drawn to be representative of the migrant farmworker population might be quite different.

In any case, it may be misleading to use these statistics blindly, without considering the adequacy of the sampling method and the extremely small size of the sample.

U. S. Department of Labor

The Rural Manpower Service of the U.S. Department of Labor receives in-season farm labor reports for the 15th of each month from all major agricultural areas (i.e., having at least an estimated 100 workers). These are usually multi-county areas. They numbered 261 altogether in 1969.

Included in the USDL statistics are actual work-load data, representing workers recruited and placed through the public employment service.

These work-load data are typically supplemented by estimates based on crop acreages, the previous year's experience, estimates by growers of their hired farm worker requirements, and other data. They include data on local workers, and on intra-and inter-state workers. Essentially they are working estimates accumulated to meet the needs of the Employment Service.

State-by-State data are published by the USDL at the end of each year showing the peak-month employment and the date of the peak month for each State. Also State data appear monthly in the USDL publication, "Farm Labor Developments." (See attached.)

*The Immigration Service does not have records that provide data on farmworkers crossing back and forth across the Border. The Texas Good Neighbor Commission

estimates that legal commuters from Mexico to the United States in 1969 numbered possibly up to 250,000. It is further estimated that 42 percent of the commuter workers were employed in agriculture.

In addition, apprehensions of illegal entrants in 1969 by immigration officials totalled 283,000. (Among this latter group there may have been many repeaters.) Thirty percent of the illegals were working in agriculture. Only half of the apprehensions were in the border States.

How many illegals crossed the border without being apprehended can only be guessed at.

The Department of Labor does not routinely request information on non-working dependents. However, in response to requests from the Migrant Health Program, the USDL has asked local employment officers from time to time to estimate the ratio of non-working dependents to workers in the migrant population.

Unlike the USDA data which start with age 14, those of the USDL start with age 16. The USDL does not include migratory workers involved in seasonal food processing in its estimates of the agricultural labor force. Nor does it include persons seeking work or available for work but temporarily unemployed.

The USDL counts as migrants only persons away from the place they call home. Thus migrants at their home-base are classified as "local" workers if they become part of the local hired farm work force.

Table 2 includes State-by-State data from the U. S. Department of Labor for the years 1958, 1963 and 1968. Basic problems are inherent in these data for Public Health Service use. The counting of home-based migrants as local workers in such States as Texas, New Mexico and Missouri results in a serious under-estimate of potential migrants in need of health services.

The fluctuations in the count for some States from year to year can be explained by such contributing factors as the termination of the P. L. 78 (or "bracero") program. States such as California and Florida relied to a considerable extent on foreign importation of workers. Thus the estimates for these States are relatively low for 1963 but rise in 1968.

The USDL peak estimates are not additive since peaks occur at different times of year in different States. However, the fact that crop areas with less than 100 workers are excluded may mean considerable "fall-out" in parts of the country where migrants tend to be fairly widely and thinly scattered. It should also be recognized that 100 workers may represent twice that number of persons present in the area.

The exclusion of food processing workers from USDL statistics may also mean a rather significant "fall-out" in areas where seasonal canneries near the fields employ a considerable number of migrants. These migrants may be in the fields one day and in the canneries the next. They live in the same type of camps as field workers and often in the same camps.

Office of Economic Opportunity

The Title III-B program under OEO provides grant assistance for projects serving both migrant and other seasonal farm worker families. Applicants must provide information on the total population in the project area that can potentially be served. Current national OEO estimates of their total target population including both migrant and nonmigrant components approximate 6.6 million. Of these they estimate about one million are migrant farmworkers and family dependents. They use as a basis the USDA's estimate of 257,000 workers multiplied by a factor to obtain an estimate of family dependents of workers and/round the total to one million.

From time to time OEO has contracted with research organizations for special migrant studies. These have been useful checks on other sources of migrant data.

VISTA workers have surveyed migrants in a few areas, producing reports useful to local migrant health projects and to the national program.

Office of Education

Under its Title I program for migrant children, the Office of Education has just initiated a national computerized system for school record transfer, based at the University of Arkansas Medical School. A system of child identification has been established which, it is hoped, will eliminate duplicated counts. In the States using this computerized system it may be possible to get some estimates of child population that are more accurate than any available in the past. These estimates should be available within about one year.

At present the Office of Education estimates the total migrant child population served at about one-fourth million. Once identified as a child travelling with a migrant farm worker, a child is retained by the OOE in its Title I program for five years.

Special Studies

Texas Good Neighbor Commission

The chief source of estimates used by the Migrant Health Program for migrants home-based in Texas has been the annual reports of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission. The Commission reports each year on the number of home-based migrants by principal city or county of residence. The

reports do not provide as much information on the sources from which estimates are derived as would be desirable.

Migrant Children in Florida

In 1968-69, the University of Miami conducted an exhaustive State-wide study of migrant children in Florida. This was funded by the State Department of Education. The study includes county-by-county data on the number and distribution of migratory workers and on migrant children.

The Florida study estimates that children in school represent three-fourths of the States' migrant children. The peak month for school enrollment statewide was February with 27,000 migrant children enrolled. (Most children start working by age 12.) The Statewide total of workers reported by the Florida Industrial Commission in the year of the study was 31,500. This doubtless included some children.

Using the Florida study's basis for estimates, would yield a minimal total of about 67,000 migrants in the State in 1968-69, assuming that all parents were workers. This can be compared with the USDL's estimate of 21,500, excluding children under 16 who worked and excluding all nonworking dependents. Also excluded were migrants working at their home-base and classified by the USDL as "local" workers.

Special studies, ERS, USDA

From time to time the USDA has special questions added to the annual survey in December. From the responses it develops reports on characteristics of hired farmworker households (See reports of 1949 and 1950; 1962), personal and economic characteristics of domestic migratory farmworkers (1967 report), etc.

In 1965, the number of children under 14 was estimated at nearly one-fourth million; 140,000 travelling with the workers. The estimated total migrant workers remained at about one-half million in 1965 according to the USDA.

The USDA, in cooperation with agricultural experiment stations, has also developed special studies of migrants in various parts of the country. These reports provide detailed information on the migrant population in particular areas at particular times.

Reports of State committees, commissions and agencies

Over the years State committees and commissions have published a variety of reports dealing with migrants--their number, characteristics, etc.--throughout the State or in selected areas of the State. Oregon, California, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin are among the States which have published such reports.

The State Employment Service in each of the States also publishes an annual farm labor report. Some of these have provided valuable information on the migrant population, its size, source, next work destination, crops worked in, and other items.

1963 pilot study in Stanislaus County, California

Under the auspices of the Farm Workers Health Service in California, a detailed study of Stanislaus County's migrant population was undertaken in 1963. The State Departments of Employment, Education, Welfare, Public

Health, and Agriculture were all said to be "plagued" by the "unknowns" about California's farm worker population. Among the underlying reasons for these unknowns, as identified by the study report, are the following. (Some of these also call into question other study reports.)

1. The farm labor work force, while remaining fairly constant in total size, is subject to continual internal change in individuals. The State director of the Department of Employment commented that "Labor turnover...is a problem in all types of employment, but in no industry does the degree of the problem approach that found in agriculture." Workers move from day to day, as well as from season to season.
2. It is difficult to determine, on any day or in any week or month, who is a farm worker and who is not. Many persons are loath to admit that they are.
3. Mobility makes the avoidance of multiple enumerations of the same individual difficult.
4. No agency of government has authority to follow and count migratory workers in the way that the Department of Interior follows migratory birds. The motivation to experiment has never existed; techniques have never been perfected; and the task has been dismissed as impossible.
5. Farm workers have been excluded from social legislation so that the benefit of using service records for statistical information has been lost, as well as the tangible benefits accruing to workers.
6. Farm workers, traditionally, have been viewed as in "abundant supply." Time and motion studies, turnover rates, and production rates per

individual are not available in the agricultural industry, so work required or expended cannot be translated into number of individuals working.

7. Politics of farm labor has made enumeration difficult, and has led to questioning of the validity of data.
8. Family instability, language and literacy barriers, and unpleasant experiences with official representatives lead the "lowly" to "lie with discretion, or to give 'the right answer' with no compunctions."
9. Farm labor studies are usually concerned with special problems, or documentation of special need. Funds for collecting basic information for general use are notably lacking. Personnel recruited for the studies may come from the agency to be affected. They may limit their "study" to their own clientele for services. Usually no information is available on non-clients.
10. Most research workers or qualified interviewers come from urban areas; few are trained or experienced in working in a migrant labor camp or other rural slum.
11. Some data are collected but never reported.
12. Data are collected at times and places inappropriate in relation to the employment pattern of migrants. Also the questions may be inappropriate--not geared to highly seasonal, mobile workers.

A three-month pilot research study was undertaken in Stanislaus County to determine the size and composition of seasonal farmworker households; family members present and those left behind at home base; number of workers in each household; pattern of travel; type of housing used; and experiences with health facilities and services.

A random sample of 329 seasonal farm worker households in the county were interviewed. These represented one out of seven occupied farmworker housing units. The total number of farmworker households found was considerably smaller than that reported by the State Employment Security Office.

Of the 329 households, 20 percent were local and did not travel, 9 percent migrated out of the county, and the remainder were in-migrants, including 12 percent who had come to the county with the intent of staying but did not yet qualify for the benefits of county health programs and 1 percent who were unsettled--not knowing what their future would be.

The data provided a firmer base for program planning in Stanislaus County. The study method might be one that could be used productively elsewhere if funds for such study could be made available. However, single county data of this nature are of little help in developing a national estimate.

MIGRANT HEALTH PROGRAM

Annual progress reports of migrant health projects

County-by-county monthly data on migrant workers and nonworking dependents, and annual data on the number, age, and sex in the peak month, are routine requirements for the annual progress reports from each migrant

health project receiving grant assistance under the Migrant Health Program. Data are requested for each county the project includes in its service area. The source of the data is also requested as one indicator of its probable reliability.

The term "migrant" is defined as: "a worker who is now engaged primarily in agricultural or related seasonal industry, or who has been so engaged at one or more times during the past two crop seasons, and who must move so far in the course of his regular annual employment that he must establish a temporary residence at one or more locations away from the place he calls home. This definition includes family dependents who may or may not move with the worker. Persons who leave an area temporarily to go elsewhere for agricultural work for several weeks or months, as well as those who come into an area for agricultural work, are considered migrants within the program's definition.

Persons leaving their home-base area to work elsewhere are commonly referred to as "out-migrants." Those coming into an area for temporary work are considered "in-migrants."

In the process of developing the 1967-68 data, Public Health Service staff discovered that although the largest home-base areas continued to be in southern Texas, southern Florida, New Mexico, Arizona, the "boot-heel" of Missouri and southern California, other home-base areas have developed over the years in States such as Washington and Oregon, Michigan, and North Carolina. There are also many migrant "drop-outs" scattered through many small/northern communities and rural fringe areas who may at times resume their former migratory farm labor status. Usually their range of travel is more limited than before. Often it is confined to a single State.

It was hoped that the monthly population data supplied by projects would be adequate for developing "person-year" estimates of the potential number to be served in a project area. Such estimates would provide for a more equitable comparison of potential workload from project to project than is now possible. It would also provide data that could be added together to get an estimated national work-load estimate for the total program. These hopes have not been realized.

The peak population figures reported have been used for each project as an "outside" estimate of the number of migrants having geographic, economic and social access to local project services. Peak data, of course, cannot be added together to get a national total without allowance for duplication from one area to another.

The term "access to service" has been used to avoid such a term as "coverage" with its connotation of protection following the person wherever he may be (as in private insurance or Medicare). The term "served" obviously would be inappropriate since ^{on} the average not more than half of the people in a project county at some time during the project year actually have one or more service contacts.

In most local areas, the peak population figure is smaller than the total number of individuals in the area during the crop season. At present the report form does not take turnover into account.

In a few cases, migrant health projects actually conduct censuses at one or more times during the project period. In project areas with relatively large numbers, such censuses have not been possible. Most projects tend



prior to 1954

Published data from available sources/provided only crop area, State or national estimates. Since health and other services are usually organized on a county-wide basis, there was a great need for migrant population estimates by county as a basis for planning for the extension of local services to migrants.

Public Health staff made detailed use of unpublished USDL records from local reporting areas. These were supplemented by the reports of special studies, the expert opinion of persons in the Departments of Labor and agriculture, and the opinions of the staff of State agencies, Migrant Ministry workers, and others. The first edition of the map was published jointly by Public Health Service and Children's Bureau. Later the map was revised and produced by the Public Health Service.

In recent years the system of developing county statistics for the map has been modified to make use of the reports of migrant health grant assisted projects for the approximately 300 counties where they operate. These data have been supplemented by information from the sources previously used.

The Department of Labor has cooperated readily in every effort of the Migrant Health Program to refine its data and make it more adaptable for use as the basis for planning the extension of health and other services to migrant workers and families. The staff members of the Department of Labor have made their unpublished records available, and worked with Public Health Service staff to break crop-area reports of workers into county-by-county estimates. Since many counties and parts of counties are included in some crop areas, only rough estimates are possible.

Both ^{the} Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture have helped Public Health Service staff to develop appropriate factors to apply to worker

data in order to develop estimates for the total migrant population including nonworking family dependents. Special studies in Texas, Florida and other States include information on family size and characteristics. These have also been used in developing the multiplying factors to be applied to the worker data in order to estimate the total migrant population.

Home-base data as part of 1967-68 effort

Early in the Migrant Health Program, there was a great deal of public interest in serving migrants in the home-base areas. Accordingly, the Migrant Health Program placed emphasis on the encouragement of project development in migrants' home-base areas. However, no agency had previously developed data on the migrant home-base population. Local project applicants used interstate recruitment records of the Employment Service, local school records, the records of local grocery stores, and the informed opinion of a variety of local people as the chief sources of data on the numbers of migrant workers and families who left the area periodically for crop work elsewhere, returning when the crop season was over. As the projects operated, some were able to refine these data, based on information collected through their own operation.

For the year 1967-68, the Migrant Health Program made its first national effort to collect and systematize county-by-county data on home-based migrants, simultaneously updating its work area data. Migrant health project reports were the chief source of the home-base county data, supplemented by Department of Labor data on sources of farm worker recruitment and numbers of persons recruited. Rough drafts of both home-base

and work area data were reviewed by the Regional Migrant Health Representatives before the final listing of number of home-based or work area migrants by county was prepared. This list was requested by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor and published in the appendix of their February 1969 report on migratory labor. (See attached.)

A draft map was also prepared showing the distribution of migrants in both home-base and work counties, with the counties included in grant-assisted migrant health projects superimposed. A second draft map showing the distribution of migrants indicates the counties which are outside the areas of grant-assisted migrant health projects. Neither of these draft maps has been published. (See attached listing of agricultural migrants by State and county with service categories indicated for counties included in migrant health grant-assisted project areas.)

Public Health Service State Population Data, 1970

With the March 1970 amendments to the Migrant Health Act, the target population was expanded to include "persons (and their families) who perform seasonal agricultural services similar to the services performed by domestic agricultural migratory workers if the Secretary finds that the provision of health services under this sentence will contribute to the improvement of the health conditions of such migratory workers and their families." Various Congressional documents (floor statements in the House and Senate, and the reports of both Houses on the bill) elaborate on this expansion of the population toward which the Act is directed. They indicate, for example, that other seasonal farm workers and families are to be served where they live and work side by side with migrants and are practically indistinguishable from the migrant population.

New Paragraph

Using the new definition of the target population, State-by-State data were developed for migrants, and for other persons to be served in migrant-impacted counties. (See table 3.) Migrant data were drawn from recent migrant health project applications and reports, supplemented by data from the 1969 Senate Subcommittee report. For purposes of obtaining an up-duplicated national estimate, the reported migrant figures were divided by two. This was on the assumption that the average length of stay for migrants in either the home-base or the work areas was about six months.*

Data for other seasonal farmworkers were obtained from recent migrant health project applications, supplemented by the U. S. Department of Labor's monthly publication, Farm Labor Developments, November and December 1969 issues. The latter give total local hired seasonal farm workers on a State-by-State basis in the fall of 1969 (August or September). The estimates of local workers were theoretically subject to two types of adjustment--one upward to take account of nonworking family members of workers and the other downward to take account of the fact that local workers are employed outside, as well as within, migrant-impacted areas. Assuming that these two types of adjustment would tend to balance each other, no adjustment was made. It is believed that the number of

*The length of stay may instead be closer to four months on the average. According to the Florida study mentioned earlier, Negro families reported moving an average of two times and Spanish-speaking families three times.

local workers may be seriously underestimated since many find jobs without the assistance of the Employment Service. Accordingly data on local, nonmigrant, seasonal farmworkers are believed to be conservative.

Table 4 compares Migrant Health Program statistics with those of the USDL. Obviously, since USDL unpublished statistics are the major source of much of the data used by the Migrant Health Program, there should be similarity in the two sets of figures. When adjustments are made for the fact that persons defined by the Migrant Health Program^{as} "out-migrants" are excluded from the USDL figures as "local" workers, and when a factor for dependents is applied to USDL worker figures, the differences in the two sets of figures do not seem important for most of the States.

CONCLUSIONS

The estimate of one million migrants that has been used by the Migrant Health Program probably was somewhat low in the past. Now it may be high, possibly exceeding the actual number of persons who move in a given year by as much as 250,000. If, however, other needy seasonal farmworker families living year round in migrants' home-base areas are to be part of the target population, in accordance with the 1970 amendments, the ^{current} 1.6 million national estimate is probably conservative. (See table 3.)

Several agencies of this Department--notably the Office of Education and HSMHA--have programs especially designed to help meet migrants' needs. Others, such as Medicaid, Hill-Burton and Partnership for Health, include migrants in the scope of their concern for the general population. Furthermore,

Department-wide goals at present set priority on meeting the needs of agricultural migrants. Accordingly, all service-related DHEW programs--whether especially geared to serve migrants or designed to serve the total population of which migrants are a small part--share the need to know the number of migrants, where they are concentrated, and how long they stay in each area. Against the background of such information, the program staff members can determine whether, and how much, their services touch migrants' lives.

Certainly the necessary statistical skills are available in this Department, working with agencies of other Departments with similar needs, to develop a periodic sampling system that would improve upon the population data now available. This should not be done at the cost of diminishing grant support for migrant services. Rather it should be part of the direct operating responsibility of the agencies to obtain population data against which they can measure how adequately their services reach this particular needy population.

The national system for computerizing migrant school children's records, sponsored by the Office of Education, may in the future furnish a basis for statistical sampling to get more accurate estimates of the total migrant population. Potentially it could also become a family and individual migrant registry useful to all service agencies.

Statisticians engaged in developing and implementing a sampling system should work closely with service program representatives knowledgeable about the migrant situation. Only in this way can there be assurance that any statistical approach devised is adapted to this highly mobile population, and will provide the basic data required to plan and deliver services.

Since health or other services can be provided only in the places where migrants are present, the need for reasonably accurate population estimates

as a basis for planning is greatest--not at the national level--but in local migrant-impacted areas. Even in these areas, reasonably accurate estimates are difficult to get for such obvious reasons as the vagaries of weather and other conditions which affect the amount of work to be done and thus the number of workers required.

Assistance could be provided to migrant-impacted areas in refining their present system of estimating the size of their target population. In providing such assistance, it must be recognized that labor requirements and labor available may be quite different. Generally the labor available exceeds requirements. As long as worker-employer ties continue to be as tenuous as they are in the migrant farm labor market, growers are likely to continue to over-estimate their labor needs in trying to make certain that the supply of workers will be ample when the time of need comes. The fact that twice the number of workers needed may come to the area is not a real concern of the employer. Typically, he has no obligation to particular workers to provide them a full day's work each day for a specified period at a specified rate of payment.

The tenuousness of their job ties affects the behavior of the workers, also. If jobs in another location promise more than where they are now working, they will take off and perhaps so flood the labor market at the new location that no worker comes out well.

The national decline over the years in the number of man-hours of work required in agriculture is unmistakable. It has affected all segments of the farm work force including farm owner-operators and their families as well as migrants. The decline seems likely to continue. The decline in work alternatives for unskilled, under-educated and often physically handicapped people also seems

likely to continue. Thus the situation for the remaining migrants and other seasonal farmworkers is likely to become increasingly desperate as underemployment and unemployment spread among them.

The "cream" is being constantly skimmed off the top of the farm work force leaving behind those least able to compete. The decline in farm or alternative work opportunity does not suddenly erase the people left behind. Moreover, the open Mexican border as well as the persistent rural pockets of poverty within the boundaries of the United States assures constant replenishment from the bottom of many of those siphoned off at the top.

In the face of this situation, the need for accurate migrant population estimates is not nearly as great as the need for a comprehensive national farm labor policy. Implementing such a policy would be likely to make more accurate data available almost automatically.

The following would be among the ingredients of a comprehensive policy:

1. Conscientious farm-by-farm and area-by-area preseason determination of farm labor demand in relation to local supply, in order to estimate additional labor requirements. Job analysis as the basis for estimating man-hour requirements should be possible in agriculture just as in other industry. It should also be possible to identify local workers available for farm work. The excess of need over supply would represent the need for labor from outside the local area.
2. Recruitment for the period of need of only such additional workers from out of the area as are required to supplement the local labor force.
3. Establishment of a bona fide contractual relationship between farm employers and farm workers in which each party negotiates on an equal basis with supervision by an outside third party agreeable to both employers and workers.

4. Extension to hired farmworkers of benefits of unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, public assistance, Medicaid, and other protections available to the general population from which agricultural workers are usually excluded, in some cases by law and in others by State and local policy and procedures.
5. Provision for supplementation of local health services, housing, etc. as needed for the duration of migrants' stay in a local area.
6. Development of alternative opportunities, acceptable to the workers, for individual or family support as some workers are displaced from the farm labor market. Supportive health, education, housing and social services should be included in this effort in order to facilitate a smooth transition to nonfarm sources of income.

The development of a national farm labor policy should be accompanied by massive effort, combining public and private resources, to rehabilitate persistent pockets of rural poverty and thus "dry up" the migrant streams at their source. It is recognized that although some of these sources are "rural" in terms of the character of the people involved, they are actually located in the heart of cities such as San Antonio or in the rural fringe areas of cities such as Fresno. The new farm labor policy should also be accompanied by an international border effort to resolve the social and economic problems on both sides of the border that have contributed for many generations to the constant cross-border flow of needy people.

The implementation of a coherent, integrated national farm labor policy would be costly, especially at first. A minimal tax on the types of foods

which depend heavily on migratory labor might be the most logical source of support. Food tax proposals have met heavy resistance in the past. The alternative that has been relied upon to keep cheap food on our tables is a hidden tax on those least able to sustain it - the families of seasonal farmworkers.

Table 1 - FARM WAGE WORK: NUMBER OF PERSONS EMPLOYED FOR ANY PERIOD DURING SPECIFIC YEARS, BY MIGRATORY AND NONMIGRATORY STATUS, SELECTED YEARS, 1949-69

(In thousands)

Year	Domestic farmworkers		
	Total	Migratory	Nonmigratory
1969.....	2,571	257	2,314
1967.....	3,078	276	2,802
1966.....	2,763	351	2,412
1965.....	3,128	466	2,662
1964.....	3,370	386	2,984
1963.....	3,597	386	3,212
1962.....	3,622	380	3,242
1961.....	3,488	395	3,094
1960.....	3,693	409	3,284
1959.....	3,577	477	3,100
1957.....	3,962	427	3,535
1956.....	3,575	427	3,149
1954.....	3,009	365	2,644
1952.....	2,980	352	2,628
1949.....	4,140	422	3,718

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, April 1970.

Table 2 - ESTIMATED PEAK EMPLOYMENT OF MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS BY STATE

<u>State</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1968</u>
Alabama	3,200	1,400	1,700
Arkansas	4,965	6,500	1,500
Arizona	13,114	2,800	4,200
California	58,750	47,700	62,500
Colorado	10,097	7,800	7,800
Connecticut	4,030	3,300	5,700
Delaware	4,102	3,900	2,000
Florida	27,790	18,200	21,500
Georgia	3,946	300	500
Idaho	9,570	9,600	6,400
Illinois	6,576	6,300	4,000
Indiana	6,208	8,300	9,000
Iowa	526	800	600
Kansas	21,200	15,800	3,300
Kentucky	875	1,200	600
Louisiana	2,900	2,200	800
Maine	558	200	400
Maryland	4,250	3,000	2,600
Massachusetts	2,015	1,700	2,900
Michigan	50,822	44,600	40,000
Minnesota	5,368	6,200	6,300
Mississippi	1,323	1,800	- - -
Missouri	14,500	4,200	200
Montana	7,889	5,100	6,400
Nebraska	4,835	2,900	3,800
Nevada	870	300	- - -
New Hampshire	282	300	200

<u>State</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1968</u>
New Jersey	14,842	12,300	12,100
New Mexico	1,310	1,600	900
New York	28,276	22,000	14,800
North Carolina	12,522	14,000	8,700
North Dakota	8,521	7,100	5,600
Ohio	9,121	12,100	18,500
Oklahoma	10,955	8,600	13,000
Oregon	24,216	20,500	13,300
Pennsylvania	6,792	6,300	5,900
Rhode Island	---	----	100
South Carolina	3,725	8,300	4,100
South Dakota	4,000	2,200	---
Tennessee	427	500	400
Texas	82,315	29,700	19,800
Utah	5,427	1,900	2,700
Vermont	247	200	100
Virginia	11,735	10,200	4,400
Washington	18,658	19,100	12,500
West Virginia	578	800	700
Wisconsin	10,051	10,900	6,900
Wyoming	1,870	2,200	2,900

Source: Data for selected years are from reports of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security. Data include domestic intra-state, interstate and Puerto Rican workers over 16; they exclude food processing workers. Reported data include only areas in which at least 100 migrant workers are reported as employed at the peak. Nonworking family dependents are excluded. So, also are migrants working (or unemployed) in the areas they call "home". Workers seeking employment are also excluded.

Table 3 - Estimated peak number of migrants including workers and family dependents, and estimated number of other seasonal farmworkers and family dependents in migrant-impacted areas, by State, 1969

<u>State</u>	<u>Migrants</u>	<u>Other</u>
Alabama	5,380	6,345
Arizona	61,274	29,400
Arkansas	8,332	3,700
California	177,072	148,300
Colorado	25,370	4,970
Connecticut	11,672	8,960
Delaware	3,500	2,165
Florida	169,172	26,896
Georgia	1,324	22,255
Hawaii	475	no
Idaho	20,004	6,120
Illinois	19,518	4,350
Indiana	22,280	4,800
Iowa	2,990	10,011
Kansas	4,936	8,445
Kentucky	926	23,923
Louisiana	6,452	4,275
Maine	2,050	8,998
Maryland	4,656	4,564
Massachusetts	5,000	10,302
Michigan	98,212	22,035
Minnesota	11,000	3,269
Mississippi	6,208	2,120
Missouri	9,228	10,000
Montana	12,222	5,170
Nebraska	8,200	7,214
Nevada	1,186	600

<u>State</u>	<u>Migrants</u>	<u>Other</u>
New Hampshire	108	1,179
New Jersey	15,194	6,355
New Mexico	30,752	1,200
New York	29,280	8,650
North Carolina	26,360	172,445
North Dakota	6,136	4,889
Ohio	32,584	14,652
Oklahoma	16,854	11,125
Oregon	44,072	53,965
Pennsylvania	8,926	11,230
Puerto Rico	40,000	120,000
Rhode Island	464	41
South Carolina	11,048	19,450
South Dakota	1,966	5,898
Tennessee	2,680	23,045
Texas	239,796	98,725
Utah	8,284	2,385
Virginia	10,172	6,393
Washington	45,092	29,920
West Virginia	1,392	638
Wisconsin	19,688	5,565
Wyoming	5,998	1,684
Total	<u>1,335,064</u>	<u>984,122</u>
	<u>2</u>	
	667,532	man-years

Source: Migrant data are from migrant health project estimates of workers and family members by county, supplemented by county estimates based chiefly on USDL worker data and applying a factor that allows for nonworking family dependents. The Public Health Service worked from USDL unpublished source materials to develop the latter estimates.

The migrant population figures include data from both home-base counties where no farm work is done and work counties. The estimate for each county is the peak figure and does not take local turnover into account. Counties with less than an estimated 100 migrants were excluded.

Adding together the county migrant data obviously represents duplication. The total for each State probably should be divided by at least two to get an appropriate person-year figure.

The figures for other seasonal farmworkers were derived in part from project applications. These were supplemented by USDL State data on local seasonal farmworkers in either August or September 1969, whichever was higher. No adjustment was made in these USDL figures since an increase to take account of nonworking family dependents was presumed to be offset by a decrease necessitated by the fact that not all local farmworkers were employed in migrant-impacted areas.

Table 4 - Estimated peak number of migrants, including workers only, in 1968 (USDL statistics) compared with Migrant Health Program estimates /1 of migrants, including workers and dependents, by State.

<u>State</u>	<u>USDL (workers only)</u>	<u>Migrant Health Program (Workers and Dependents)</u>
Alabama	1,700	5,380
Arizona	4,200 <u>/2</u>	61,274
Arkansas	1,500	8,332
California	62,000	177,092
Colorado	7,800 <u>/2</u>	25,370
Connecticut	5,700	11,672
Delaware	2,000	3,500
Florida	21,500 <u>/2</u>	169,172
Georgia	500	1,324
Hawaii	---	475
Idaho	6,400	20,004
Illinois	4,000	19,518
Indiana	9,000	22,280
Iowa	600	2,990
Kansas	3,300	4,936
Kentucky	600	926
Louisiana	800	6,452
Maine	400	2,050
Maryland	2,600	4,656
Massachusetts	2,900	5,000
Michigan	40,000	98,212

/1 Estimates in some cases include data for 1969. Generally they are for 1967-68. (See also footnotes for preceding tables.)

/2 Home-based migrants are excluded from USDL data.

<u>State</u>	<u>USDL (workers only)</u>	<u>Migrant Health Program (workers and dependents)</u>
Minnesota	6,300	11,000
Mississippi	--- <u>1/2</u>	6,208
Missouri	200 <u>1/2</u>	9,228
Montana	6,400	12,222
Nebraska	3,800	8,200
Nevada	---	1,186
New Hampshire	200	108
New Jersey	12,100	15,194
New Mexico	900	30,752
New York	14,800	29,280
North Carolina	8,700	26,360
North Dakota	5,600	6,136
Ohio	18,500	32,584
Oklahoma	13,000	16,854
Oregon	13,300	44,072
Pennsylvania	5,900	8,926
Puerto Rico	----- <u>1/2</u>	40,000
Rhode Island	100	464
South Carolina	4,100	11,048
South Dakota	-----	1,966
Tennessee	400	2,680
Texas	19,800 <u>1/2</u>	239,796

<u>State</u>	<u>USDL (workers only)</u>	<u>Migrant Health Program (workers and dependents)</u>
Utah	2,700	8,284
Vermont	100	---
Virginia	4,400	10,172
Washington	12,500	45,092
West Virginia	700	1,392
Wisconsin	6,900	19,688
Wyoming	2,900	5,998

Attachments

1. USDA report: The Hired Farm Working Force of Agriculture Economic Report No. 180, 1969.
2. Schedule Used as a Basis for Obtaining USDA Hired Farm Work Data in 1965 and 1966.
3. USDL report: Estimated Peak Employment and Period of Employment of Domestic Migratory Workers in Agriculture...1967.
(This is an example of the report issued annually.)
4. Appendix Material from 1969 Report of Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.
5. Draft Material Prepared by Migrant Health Program (basis for data in Senate Subcommittee Report).

(Only one set of attachments was prepared.)